

FEB 3 1944

VOLUME XXXIX

NUMBER 1

January 1944

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

THE UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN, *Managing Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER
BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER
CARL DARLING BUCK

FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON
GORDON JENNINGS LAING
RICHARD P. McKEON

RALPH MARCUS
GERTRUDE SMITH
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
WERNER JAEGER, *Harvard University*

M. L. W. LAISTNER, *Cornell University*
IVAN M. LINFORTH, *University of California*

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE, *Harvard University*

VOL. XXXIX

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY 1944

No. 1

Παροῖα	Fred W. Householder, Jr.	1
Vespasian's Spice Market and Tribute in Kind	Helen Jefferson Loane	10
The Attic Association of the Μεσότητες	Robert Schlaifer	22
Diplomatic Notes on Michigan Ostraca	Herbert C. Youtie	28
Notes and Discussions		40
<p>MERIWEATHER STUART: <i>P. Oxyrhynchus</i> 668.188-90.—FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN: <i>Cicero De natura deorum</i> iii. 53 ff.—B. L. ULLMAN: <i>Dionysius on Saturnian Verse</i>.—F. P. JOHNSON: <i>On Reading von Duhn</i>.—AGNES KIRSOPP MICHELS: <i>The Consualia of December</i>.</p>		
Book Reviews		51
<p>E. H. STURTEVANT: <i>The Indo-Hittite Laryngeals</i> (Bonfante).—JOHN H. FINLEY, JR.: <i>Thucydides</i> (Cochrane).—DAVID GRENE: <i>Three Greek Tragedies in Translation</i> (Norwood).—Yale <i>Classical Studies</i>, Vol. VIII (Todd).—GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH (ed.): <i>The Complete Roman Drama</i> (Hough).—WILLIAM KELLY PRENTICE: <i>Those Ancient Dramas Called Tragedies</i> (Norwood).—SIR WILLIAM M. RAMSAY and J. G. C. ANDERSON: <i>The Social Basis of Roman Power in Asia Minor</i> (Bickerman).—MARCEL RENARD: <i>Initiation à l'étruscologie</i> (Hartmann).—S. C. E. LEGG: <i>Nouum Testamentum Graece secundum textum Westcott-Hortianum: Evangelium secundum Matthaeum</i> (Colwell).—WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL: <i>Hippocratic Medicine: Its Spirit and Method</i> (Temkin).—GEORGE H. CHASE and MARY ZELIA PEASE: <i>Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: Fogg Museum and Gallatin Collections</i> (Johnson).—HENRI PÉTRE: <i>L'Influence des littératures antiques sur la littérature française moderne</i> (Godolphin).—RICHMOND LATTIMORE: <i>Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs</i> (Helmhold).—R. D. MARTINSEN, "Some Aspects of Doric Temple Architecture" and "Space Construction in Greek Architecture"; and "Rex Distin Martienssen: In Memoriam" (Johnson).</p>		
Books Received		72

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than a full year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Republic of Honduras, Mexico, Morocco (Spanish Zone), Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rio de Oro, El Salvador, Spain (including Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, and the Spanish Offices in Northern Africa; Andorra), Spanish Guinea, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 16 cents on annual subscription (total \$4.16), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union 40 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.40), on single copies, 10 cents (total \$1.35). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill. Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

N

ifornia

No. 1

1

10

22

28

40

51

72

ity of
year;
centage
s, Co-
roooo
anary
age in
opies,
single
Press

entley
and on
pub-
stock

CLAS-

, and
1912.
ection

br
T
se
M
le
w
se
of
w
ve
cu
P
in
th
m
es
in
w
or
ri
li
th
C
pl
co
si
cl
by
tr
ca

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXXIX

JANUARY 1944

Number 1

ΠΑΡΩΔΙΑ

FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR.

I

THE old Liddell and Scott defines *παρῳδία* as "a song or poem in which serious words are changed so as to become burlesque, a burlesque, parody." The revision by Jones and McKenzie says merely, "burlesque, parody." The *New English Dictionary* defines "burlesque" as "that species of composition which excites laughter by caricature of serious works, or by a ludicrous treatment of their subjects; a literary or dramatic work of this kind." The corresponding verb is defined thus: "to turn into ridicule by grotesque parody or imitation." Parody is there defined as "a composition in which the characteristic turns of thought and phrase of an author are mimicked and made to appear ridiculous, especially by applying them to ludicrously inappropriate subjects; an imitation of a work more or less closely modeled on an original, but so turned as to produce a ridiculous effect." The other leading English dictionaries agree in all essentials with these definitions. The definitions of the *Century Dictionary* are quite full and explicit: "parody" is "a kind of literary composition in which the form and expression of grave and dignified writings are closely imitated, but are made ridiculous by the subject or method of treatment; a travesty that follows closely the form and

expression of its original; specifically a burlesque imitation of a poem, in which a trivial or humorous subject is treated in the style of a dignified or serious one." The adjective "burlesque" is defined as "tending to excite laughter by a ludicrous contrast between the subject and the manner of treating it, as when a serious subject is treated ridiculously or a trifling one with solemnity"; the noun thus: "a burlesque literary or dramatic composition."

From these definitions it is clear that there are two differences between parody and burlesque, at least according to the lexicographers. Parody must be modeled on a specific work or author; burlesque may be modeled on a whole class of works or on no particular work. Parody applies a grave style and treatment to a trivial or ludicrously inappropriate subject; burlesque may do that, or it may apply a ridiculous and low treatment to a lofty and serious subject. This recognition of two types of burlesque (not of parody) appears to derive from Addison, in the *Spectator*, No. 249.

These same two points of difference are precisely the ones made in the *Century Dictionary*, s.v. "caricature," where the words "caricature," "burlesque," "parody," and "travesty" are differentiated. There it is stated in a slightly different

way that burlesque renders its subject matter ludicrous, while parody renders its form, style, and language ludicrous. Thus "parody" may be used to ridicule an author, but "burlesque," properly speaking, cannot.

There is one more point of some importance in connection with the Greek words which we are about to discuss; neither of the English words may properly be applied to a single isolated quotation used for humorous purposes. Now, while it may be freely admitted that various English-speaking people have at one time or another used these words in ways not authorized by the dictionaries, still it seems right that a Greek-English lexicon should, if possible, confine itself to the authorized meanings of English words.

II

In tracing the history of the Greek word *παρωδία* it will be necessary to consider also the related words *παρωδή*, *παρωδός*, and *παρωδέω*. It will also be helpful, before considering the uses of these words, to take up their etymology and relationship.

Since there is no related verb *παράδω*,¹ we must assume as the first word of this group the agent-noun *παρωδός*.² From this, probably by association with *ῥόδός* and *ῥοδή*, came *παρωδή*, and by regular derivation *παρωδέω* and *παρωδία*. This last, from its formation, seems to have been origi-

nally an abstract noun, and it is so used throughout its history; but the earliest attested use, as we shall see, is concrete.

Excluding purely local uses, *παρά* in composition with verbs and verbal nouns, sometimes also with nouns and adjectives, quite commonly has the meaning "like, resembling, changing slightly, imitating, replacing, spurious."³ Our basic sense, then, would seem to have been "singing in imitation, singing with a slight change [e.g., of subject matter].

Turning now to the occurrences of these words in ancient authors, we find that we can distinguish three distinct uses with a number of subordinate senses. Considering them in their probable historical sequence, we may say that the first use applies to complete works composed in a special style of verse; the second to the use of quotation and allusion; the third is concerned with single words. The first sense is rare, the third very rare, and the second quite common.

Apparently the earliest use of the word *παρωδία* is found in Aristotle's *Poetics* 2. 3 (1448a 12-13). Aristotle is there discussing the classification of works of art according as the object represented is made better than, the same as, or worse than reality, and he cites Hegemon as the first writer of *παρωδία*, which correspond to epics somewhat as comedy does to tragedy. The word, then, is probably as old as Hegemon. Athenaeus also mentions and quotes from Hegemon, as well as from other writers of *παρωδία*,⁴ or *παρ-*

¹ The use of *παράδω* in Homer (*Od.* xlii. 348) is irrelevant. There the *παρά* retains its separate function, being closely joined in thought with the preceding dative: "to sing beside you, in your presence, for you."

² For the principles of word-formation involved here see C. D. Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933), and A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1917). For the formation in -*ος*, Buck, pars. 449, 517 B, 523. 1, 525; and Debrunner, pars. 44, 97, 280; for that in -*ια*, Buck, par. 455. 2, Debrunner, par. 287; for the verbs in -*ω*, Buck, pars. 355. 2, 356, 363. 2, Debrunner, pars. 175, 187, 191.

³ E.g., see Liddell-Scott-Jones, s.v. *παράσῃμος*, *παρά-τράγῃδος*, *παράβλῃτος*, *παράγραμμα*, *παράτοικος*, *παράτρεβος* I, 4, *παρέγω* II, 5, *παράκοιός* III, and many others.

⁴ Hegemon in i. 5b; ix. 406e-407b; xv. 699a; Hermippus in xv. 699a; Matro or Matreas in i. 5a; ii. 62c, 64c; iii. 73d; iv. 134d-137c, 183a; xiv. 656e; xv. 697f; Xenophanes of Colophon in ii. 54e. The passage in Athenaeus 697f-699c, largely derived from Polemo, is our chief source of knowledge of this type of literature. Among other parodists mentioned there are Euboeus, Hermogenes, one or more Phillips, Cleonicus, Boeotus, Hipponax, Epicharmus, and Cratinus are

φῶδαι.⁵ In xiv. 638b he quotes a passage from Aristoxenus which includes these words: ὥσπερ τῶν ἐξαμέτρων τινὲς ἐπὶ τὸ γελοῖον παρωδᾶς εὔρον, οὕτως καὶ τῆς κιθαρωδίας πρῶτος Οἰνώπας. Beginning at xv. 698b he quotes a long discussion of such παρωδαί from Polemo (76 [Preller]), who, in 699c, quotes an epigram of Alexander the Aetolian containing these words, applied to a composer of παρωδαί: ἐγραφε / εὐ παρ' Ὀμηρεῖν ἀγλαίην ἐπέων. In ii. 54e he refers to the παρωδαί of Xenophanes of Colophon, meaning thereby what other writers (e.g., Sch. Ar. *Eq.* 408) call σῖλλοι. Similarly Diogenes Laertius (ix. 111), speaking of Timon the sillographer, says: σιλλαίνει τοὺς δογματικούς ἐν παρωδίας εἶδει.

From these passages, from the reference in Aristotle, and from the numerous quotations in Athenaeus, we may infer the earliest attested sense of παρωδία. It is a narrative poem of moderate length,⁶ in epic meter, using epic vocabulary, and treating a light, satirical, or mock-heroic subject.⁷ Not only words but phrases and lines are borrowed from Homer. There seems to be no evidence that the names παρωδή and παρωδία were ever applied to

such compositions in other meters or in prose, or to any imitating the language of other authors than Homer.⁸ The *Balrachomyomachia* is the only complete work of this type still extant.

If we now attempt to determine the applicability of the English words "parody" or "burlesque" to such compositions, we find that in a general way either term is applicable; these παρωδαί do treat a trivial or humorous subject in the style of of a grave and serious one. If we consider the precise application and the distinction of the terms, we find that neither fits perfectly, but "parody" fits better. The ancient genre takes its style from a definite author—Homer—or at least from a small body of serious literature—the epic. To this extent the term "burlesque" does not fit. But an English parody may be based on any serious work, a freedom which reflects one of its common purposes—critical ridicule. There does not seem to be a grain of evidence that any ancient παρωδαί were designed to ridicule Homer, and at least some of them (the *silli*) were intended to ridicule the persons and ways of life which formed their subject matter. In general these works are merely amusing, sometimes satirical, but never critical of Homer's style. In this way the term

said to have composed passages in this vein. The name παρωδός is five times applied to Matro (in all but the third, fourth, and seventh of the above-cited passages), and is also six times applied to Sopater, although his works are never called παρωδαί but always δράματα. Sopater is also called φλυαγογράφος by Athenaeus (five times), and his works seem to have been tragic burlesques, essentially, though not precisely, like the φλύακες of Rhinthon. Evidently Athenaeus was a little uncertain how to classify Sopater; his first reference calls him φλυαγογράφος, the next five παρωδός, and the last four again φλυαγογράφος. So far as I know, these are the only occurrences of the word παρωδός in Greek literature. The modern authorities on ancient mock-epic are P. Brandt, *Corpusculum poeseos epicae ludibundae* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1888), and A. Wieland *De praecipuis parodiis Homeri scriptorum* (1833).

⁵ This form is found in the manuscripts at ii. 54e and xiv. 638b.

⁶ Athenaeus (iv. 134d–137c) quotes 120 verses, apparently constituting the major portion of one, the Δείπρον of Matro.

⁷ Athenaeus cites several Δείπνα and a Γυγαντομαχία by Hegemon (ix. 407a–b and xv. 699a); see especially the remarks of Polemo in Ath. 699a–c.

⁸ Aristoxenus' statement about Oenopas, cited above (from Ath. xiv. 638b), and the tentative application of the name παρωδός to Sopater (see n. 3) show that some Greeks felt the want of a general term for literary parody and burlesque, but it is only in modern (or perhaps medieval) times that the word *parodia* was actually extended. For the suggestion of Croiset (*Abridged History of Greek Literature* [London: Macmillan, 1904], p. 410) and Gulick (*Athenaeus* [Loeb ed.; London: Heinemann, 1941], vii, p. 443) that the *Iambi* of Hermippus are the *Parodiae* referred to by Polemo in Ath. xv. 699a, I can see no evidence. Gulick's reference (*ibid.*, p. 247, note c) to the fragment quoted by Athenaeus in 29e seems more reasonable. This is Frag. 82 [Kock], 12 hexameter lines. The only other long fragment of Hermippus is also in hexameters, Frag. 63 [Kock] (Ath. 27e–f), 23 lines identified as coming from the *Phormophori*. Most probably the case of Hermippus is analogous to that of Epicharmus and Cratinus mentioned by Polemo in 698c; that is, all three employed the style and form of *parodia* for longer or shorter passages in their comedies.

"burlesque" is applicable, since it may ridicule the subject.

It is this use of the word alone, as we shall see, that is covered by the definition in Liddell and Scott. In the interests of precision, however, that definition should be altered to read, "parody or burlesque of Homer; mock-epic." The verb *παρωδέω* does not happen to occur in the sense "compose parody, recite parody" of this mock-epic sort, although it very likely was so used. This *παρωδία* was a definite poetic form, and prizes were awarded for it in the poetic contests at Athens⁹ and also at Eretria.¹⁰

Out of some eighty or ninety occurrences of words related to *παρωδία*, not more than eight or nine directly concern this use. The article in Liddell and Scott is not only inaccurate but also incomplete.

III

The other uses of our group of words belong primarily to the technical terminology of rhetoricians and grammarians, although one use seems to have been adopted into the language of educated society.

Quintilian in ix. 2. 35, a discussion of *prosopopoeia*, that is, portrayal of character by appropriate speeches, says that when we imitate the style of written documents (as opposed to spoken words), the figure approaches *παρωδή*, "quod nomen ductum a canticis ad aliorum similitudinem modulatis, abusive etiam in versificationis et sermonum imitatione servatur." Philostratus (VA i. 30), speaking of the poetess Damophila, says *τὰ τοι ἐς τὴν Ἀρτεμιν καὶ παρωδῆται αὐτῇ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Σαπφῶν ἦσται*. Philodemus (*Hom.*

⁹ Polemo in Ath. xv. 699a.

¹⁰ See IG, XII, 9, 189. 11, 20. This text provides for the addition of musical contests to the festival. The list of events differs from the usual one only in the addition of the *παρωδοί* and the omission of the *αἰδητή*. The date is around 340 B.C. The "parodist" is offered the lowest prizes.

xvii. 31) in a passage which is probably a discussion of the vices of Agamemnon (the preceding context is lost) remarks that Homer himself stated one vice of the Greek leader quite plainly in *Il.* ii. 228, 231: *ἀν μὴ παρωδῇ λάθῃ φλυαροῦντος*. This seems to be a form of the common observation that the words of a character in epic, drama, or fiction need not reflect the opinions of the author. *Παρωδή* here, then, would be the *imitatio sermonum* of which Quintilian spoke, i.e., *prosopopoeia* or *ethopoeia*. Another instance which may belong here is the passage already quoted from Aristoxenus (Ath. xiv. 638b). It is perhaps difficult to make a definition from these three or four passages, but in general the sense would seem to be "close literary imitation." There is no need to compare this use in detail with the definitions of "parody" or "burlesque" in English.

If there is any distinction between *παρωδία* and *παρωδή*, it is here. We have two or three examples of *παρωδή* and one of *παρωδέω*, but none of *παρωδία* used in this general sense.

IV

The great majority of writers who use our set of words limit their application to short passages in a literary work. Such *παρωδία* is some method of quotation or allusion. In spite of fairly close agreement in usage, we may distinguish two main traditions—the grammatical, represented especially by the scholiasts on Aristophanes, and the rhetorical, represented by a large number of writers. In addition, as was suggested above, there is perhaps a third tradition reflecting the usage of polite society, which appears in such writers as Lucian, Julian, Diogenes Laertius, Athenaeus, and Philostratus. This, however, seems to be merely a special development of the grammatical use.

The Suidas lexicon, following the

scholiast on Aristophanes *Acharnians* 8, offers the following definition: τοῦτο παρῳδία καλεῖται ὅταν ἐκ τραγῳδίας μετενεχθῇ λόγος εἰς κωμῳδίαν.¹¹ The actual practice of the scholiasts,¹² however, does not limit the term to passages from tragedy. They apply the words παρῳδῶν and παρῳδία to the insertion in comedy of a brief tragic, lyric, or epic passage, either (a) substantially unchanged, (b) with substitution of one or more words, (c) in paraphrased form, or (d) so changed as to be little more than an imitation of the grammar and rhythm of the original. Of fourteen occurrences of παρῳδῶν or παρῳδία in the scholia, six refer to borrowings of type *a*, three to type *b*, two to type *c*, and three to type *d*. We can further see the inclusiveness of these terms as used in the Aristophanic scholia by observing the use of παρὰ τὰ, which, for brevity's sake, replaces some form of παρῳδῶν in a majority of notes. Although the phrase is once or twice used more loosely,¹³ meaning "with reference to," it commonly marks borrowings of the four types mentioned.¹⁴ The scholiast indicates, in one way or the other, 28 (of a possible 81)¹⁵ borrowings of type *a*, 19 (of 37) type *b*, 17 (of 40) type *c*, and 8 (of 11) type *d*. This clearly shows that he regarded no one type as exclusively παρῳδία, although the substitution type is a slight favorite.

As illustration of type *a*, *Eq.* 1099 has the following scholium: ὅλον δὲ τὸ ἱαμβικὸν παρῳδῆσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πηλέως Σοφοκλέους. This is Fragment 447 (Nauck). In type *b* the substitution is often designed to in-

crease the humor παρὰ προσδοκίαν (e.g. *Ach.* 119), or it may be a pun (e.g. *Pax* 528). The latter passage reads: ἀπέπτυσ' ἐχθροῦ φωτὸς ἐχθιστον πλέκος, which the scholiast tells us is adapted from Euripides' *Telephus* (Frag. 727 [Nauck]), with πλέκος for the original τέκος. Similar to this are a few examples in which, although the wording is unchanged, one of the words is to be taken in a different sense. Phrynichus (370 [Rutherford]) detects such a παρῳδία at *Nu.* 30 by means of his principles of Atticism—the form χρέος is used, instead of χρέως. A good example of type *c* is found in *Ra.* 101–2, which, as noted by the scholiast, paraphrases the famous line of Euripides, *Hipp.* 612. Type *d* is found, e.g., at *Ach.* 454: τί δ' ὦ τάλας σε τοῦδ' ἔχει πλέκους χρέος; on this the scholiast notes: παρὰ τὰ ἐκ Τηλέφου Εὐριπίδου (Frag. 717 [Nauck]), τί δ' ὦ τάλας σὺ τῷδε πείθεσθαι μέλλεις;

This use, as before remarked, is practically confined to the Aristophanic scholia. The English terms "parody" and "burlesque" cannot properly be applied here, since they refer either to a style of composition or to a literary work, while this use is a device for comic quotation. The relation between this use and the mock-epic sense probably lies in the fact that a παρῳδία in the earlier sense would contain many passages to which the term used in this grammatical sense might be applied. The English term "burlesque" could not fit even in this limited way, since burlesque does not require a specific literary model. The source of humor is, of course, the same—a contrast between grave style and trivial or ludicrous subject, i.e., context. It is to be noted that the scholiasts and other writers who apply these terms to short passages never use the nouns concretely—that is, they never say, "this passage is a παρῳδία"; but either παρῳδεῖ, παρῳδῆται, παρῳδία χρῆται, κατὰ

¹¹ The last three words are found in Suidas only.

¹² See the examples collected at the end of this paper, under παρῳδῶν I, 1a and παρῳδία II, 1.

¹³ E.g., on *Ach.* 637, *Lys.* 188.

¹⁴ Cf. the sch. on *V.* 1234–35, where one version of the note uses παρὰ τὰ, the other παρῳδῶν.

¹⁵ These figures for possible "parodies" are based on modern commentaries; possibly they would be higher if we had more Greek tragedy.

παρωδῖαν λέγει or some such form of expression is used.

The question as to whether such παρωδῖα normally implies ridicule or criticism of the passage or author parodied should, I believe, be answered in the negative; but, since the argument would involve examination of all the so-called parodies in Aristophanes, I will reserve it for future discussion.¹⁶ If this opinion is correct, the use of the English word "parody" in this connection has been misleading, for it is largely owing to the connotations of ridicule and criticism in that word that students of Aristophanes have assumed that he regarded Euripides as an inferior poet. I should be rather inclined to believe that Aristophanes was a great admirer of Euripides as a poet.

V

We turn now to uses of these words in rhetoric and in educated conversation. Here the context is no longer verse but either prose or colloquial speech. The quotation itself, however, is normally from poetry.

In considering these uses, therefore, we shall need a somewhat different analysis of the methods of quoting than we made for the grammatical use. Except for the grammarians, no ancient writer ever refers to exact, verbatim quotation with the terms παρωδῖα or παρωδέω. For the rest, a writer may (1) quote verse with a metrical substitution of one or more words; (2) quote part of a sentence exactly, completing the grammatical structure with some different words of his own, either (a) altering the original sense or (b) keeping it, with partial paraphrase; (3) imitate (a) the sound and form of the

original or (b) the general sense of the original, without preserving any essential words. Under 1 we may again mention three possible subtypes: (a) the surprise anticlimax substitution, (b) the punning substitution, and (c) the identical pun, or substitution in sense only.

Let us take, first, the use which I have described as belonging to polite conversation. Lucian, in *Apol.* 10(I, 717), writes: καὶ ἐν τῷ τοιοῦτῳ οἶκ ἄκαιρον ἴσως καὶ τὴν τοῦ Εὐριπίδου Μήδειαν παρακαλέσαι παρελθούσαν εἰπεῖν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ἐκείνα τὰ λαμβεῖα μικρὸν αὐτὰ παρωδήσασαν

καὶ μανθάνω μὲν οἷα δρᾶν μέλλω κακὰ,
πενία δὲ κρίσσω τῶν ἐμῶν βουλευμάτων.

This is from Euripides' *Medea* 1078-9, with *πενία* replacing the original *θυμός*—clearly our type 1. Eustathius makes a similar use of the verb in his notes on *Od.* i. 1 (1381.46) and i. 356-59 (1432.2).¹⁷ The scholiast on Lucian *Conv.* 12 applies the expression to our type 1c and Quintilian (vi. 3. 97) mentions this type of quotation, carefully distinguishing it from what he terms *παρωδῖα*. It is mainly from Diogenes Laertius (iv. 52 and 63-64) and Julian (*Symp.* 306b)¹⁸ that we come to realize the place of this form of *παρωδῖα* in the wit of cultivated society.

Here again "burlesque" does not fit at all, and "parody" not even as well as in the case of the Aristophanic "parodies."

VI

For the usual rhetorical sense we have ample authority. Hermogenes (*Meth.* 30)¹⁹ says that there are two ways of introducing verse in prose—either by direct quotation or *κατὰ παρωδῖαν*. The

¹⁷ At 523. 21-23 he uses it similarly, but without humorous implication, remarking that Homer often parodies himself.

¹⁸ *πέφκα γὰρ οὐδαμῶς ἐπιτήδειος οὔτε σκώπτειν οὔτε παρωδεῖν οὔτε γελοῖσθαι.*

¹⁹ Cf. Gregory's gloss on the passage ([Waltz] VII. 1321).

¹⁶ For a thorough investigation of some of the problems involved in the interpretation of the "parodies" in Aristophanes see A. C. Schlesinger, "Indications of Parody in Aristophanes," *TAPA*, LXVII (1936), 296-314, and "Identification of Parodies in Aristophanes," *AJP*, LVIII (1937), 296-305.

latter method is thus defined: *δταν μέρος εἰπὼν τοῦ ἔπους παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ λοιπὸν περὶ ὧς ἐρμηνεύσῃ καὶ πάλιν, τοῦ ἔπους εἰπὼν (μέρος?), ἕτερον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου προσθήῃ, ὡς μίαν γενέσθαι τὴν ἰδέαν*. Similar definitions are given by Menander ([Walz] IX, 282.24)²⁰ and John the Sicilian ([Walz] VI, 400.16). Olympiodorus has a helpful note on Plato *Alc. I* 113c (104 [Creuzer]): *διδάσκει ἡμᾶς ὁ Πλάτων πῶς δεῖ παρωδῇ παρωδεῖν χρήσεις, ὅτι οὐ δεῖ αὐτὰς τὰς χρήσεις εἰσαγαῖν . . . ἀλλὰ λέξεις τινάς*.²¹ Of this use we have many examples.²² The definitions of Hermogenes cover our types 2a and 2b; the other authors generally confine their usage to 2b, which tends, especially in the commentators on Plato and Aristotle, to run over to our 3b—vague allusion or reminiscence.²³ These same commentators also apply the terms to quotations or borrowings from prose authors.²⁴ As a proper definition for this use we would suggest: "verse quotation with partial paraphrase; loosely paraphrased quotation or reminiscence from prose or verse." This use never has humorous connotations and quite obviously has no connection with English "parody" or "burlesque."

VII

Quintilian, in vi. 3. 97, discusses the three ways in which verse may be used by an orator with humorous effect. The first is our 1c: the words are not changed, but the context suggests a different sense for one or more of them. The second is 1b: one or more words are changed to others of similar sound. Neither of these

is given any particular name, but for the third type he says we may use verses "*ficti notis versibus similes, quae παρωδία dicitur*." This is our 4a, imitation of sound and form. It must be emphasized that this definition will not apply to any occurrence of these words in Greek and that it carefully excludes the one use which is most frequent.²⁵

We may observe that Quintilian's definition of *παρωδία* here seems to be merely a specialization of his use of *παρωδή* in ix. 2. 35.

There is a difficult note in Pseudoasconius' commentary on Cicero *Verr. Act. i*. 29, which may belong here. He quotes the saturnian line attributed to Naevius ("*fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules*"), the reply ("*dabunt malum Metelli Naevio poetae*"), and continues: "*de qua parodia Cicero dixit: 'te non fato, ut ceteros ex vestra familia.'*" From the sequence one might suppose that *parodia* here referred to the second quotation. If this is called a *parodia* of the first, it can be so only in Quintilian's sense of the word; and Lewis and Short so interpret. However, since the passage in Cicero has no reference to the second line, even by implication, but only to the first, we must rather assume that this line is called *parodia*. This makes matters rather difficult, since we do not know what, if anything, Naevius was "parodying." I am inclined to suspect the text of Pseudoasconius here, since a very slight change would improve the sense enormously. If we write "*de quo parodia Cicero dixit*," we get another example of the normal rhetorical use—"with reference to this [verse] Cicero said in parody, by way of parody." The sentence of Cicero is, essentially, a prose

²⁰ Spengel (III, 413.31) adopts a reading *παρωδῶσεις* (for *παρωδῆσεις*), without any apparent reason.

²¹ In his commentary on Plato *Gorgias* 484b (129 [Norvin]), he gives as the reason for this method of quoting the avoidance of poetic words in prose.

²² See the list at the end of this paper, under *παρωδία* I, 2a and *παρωδία* II, 2.

²³ See below under *παρωδία* I, 2b.

²⁴ E.g., Simplicius in *Ph. iv. 1* (208a29: ix. 521.

25): *τοῦτε δὲ τὴν ἐν Τιμαίῳ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ῥῆσιν παρωδεῖν ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης*.

²⁵ If Quintilian were speaking of poetic composition rather than of the orator's use of verse, this definition might apply fairly well to the mock-epic variety of *parodia*, and even better to the modern conception of parody.

paraphrase of the verse with just enough adaptation to apply it in the context. The corruption can easily be explained as due to some copyist's desire to improve the concord.

VIII

Hermogenes, in *Meth.* 34, is discussing the various devices a rhetorician may use for humorous effect. Essentially, he says, there are three: τὸ κατὰ παρωδίαν σχῆμα, τὸ παρὰ προσδοκίαν, and τὸ ἐναντίας ποιεῖσθαι τὰς εἰκόνας τῇ φύσει τῶν πραγμάτων. The last two are familiar enough and clear enough, but to understand the first we must consider the examples offered by Hermogenes. The first is from Arist. *V.* 45: ὁλᾶς; Θέωλος τὴν κεφαλὴν κόλακος ἔχει, on which Hermogenes remarks that the joke lies in the word κόλακος, which, διὰ τὸ τραυλός (of Alcibiades), is said for κόρακος. The other example is from Demosthenes xviii. 130: τῇ μὲν παρωδίᾳ οὕτως (sc. χρῆται) τὸν μὲν πατέρα ἀντὶ Τρόμητος ἐποίησεν Ἀτρόμητον. These examples make it clear that παρωδία as used here means some sort of pun or word-play.²⁶ It seems possible that this use developed out of the one discussed above (1b), in which a verse is quoted with punning substitution. However, we have seen running through all these uses the underlying notion, perhaps regarded as the etymological sense, of "verbal resemblance or imitation." In that case, this use of Hermogenes is merely another specialization of what was felt to be the basic meaning of the word. There is another probable example of this use in the scholia on Lucian (*Tim.* 54).

IX

We may now try to give an account of the historical development of these words. The starting-point is the agent noun or

adjective παρωδός, conveying some such notion as "singing in imitation, an imitative singer." The word seems to suggest an intentional contrast with ραψωδός as well as with the *simplex*, the former being doubtless taken to mean "devising song, an original singer." It seems natural to suppose that the word originated in the days when wandering bards still composed and recited their hymns and epics at Ionic festivals. The first παρωδοί were probably amateurs, who would improvise brief poems in mock-epic style for the amusement of their fellow-citizens after the professionals had given a performance. Recognition of the satiric possibilities of the form and literary treatment of it were slow in coming, just as in the case of Attic comedy.

From this word came the feminines παρωδή and παρωδία in their first sense, "imitative song, mock epic," and, probably somewhat later, the verb παρωδέω, with the meaning "to sing, compose or write in the manner of mock-epic, to apply serious verses to humorous ends." This verb then developed the special uses which we have classified as the grammatical and the conversational and, under the influence of etymological consciousness, the nonhumorous application of the rhetoricians. Even by the grammarians, however, the notion of humor was not regarded as essentially present in the word.²⁷

Parallel with the development of the verb was that of the nouns, particularly παρωδία, which now became verbal abstracts with the same variety of meanings as the verb. It can easily be observed in the catalogue which follows, that in

²⁶ Gregory's commentary on Hermogenes ([Walz] VII, 1337) adds two more examples: καὶ ὁ θεολόγος κατὰ παρωδίαν τὴν Ἰουλιανὴν Εἰωλιανὴν, καὶ ὁ Μεταφράστης τὸν Δομετιανὸν Δαιμονιανὸν ὁσαύτως.

²⁷ When the presence of humor or ridicule is to be made plain, some other word is added, as in Sch. Luc. *Tim.* 54, πείσασθαι . . . παρωδήσας; Eust. *PE* x. 3 (467d), παρωδῆκε . . . ἐξελέγων; Eust. 1381.46, σκωπτικὸς παρωδήσας; Sch. Ar. *Ach.* 119 παρωδίᾳ χρῆται . . . σκώπτων Εὐριπίδην; or replaces παρωδέω. So the scholiast on Lucian uses διαρραίζει alone in this way at *Tim.* 26, and the scholiast on Aristophanes uses διαστρών at *Plut.* 39.

these uses the verb is much commoner than the noun.

Our conclusions may now be cast into the form of a set of dictionary articles, classifying all the passages on which this study is based.

παρωδέω, I. *imitate, adapt, borrow, or paraphrase* the words, style, or thought of another passage, work or author. The purpose may be satirical or humorous (so often in 1, rarely in 2), but the word itself does not imply humor. Specifically, 1 (the grammatical use) *a* *quote, paraphrase, or imitate* serious verse in comedy, lampoon, or satire, Arg. Ar. Ach., Sch. Ar. Ach. 120, 472; Eq. 1099, 1251, 1329; Pax 125; V. 1063, 1235; Pl. 253; Sch. S. El. 86, 289; Ath. viii. 364b; Eus. PE x. 3 (467d); Hsch. s.v. *παρωδοῦντες*; Phryn. 370. *b* *quote* verse (in prose, verse, or conversation) *with metrical alteration of one or more words*, Luc. Apol. 10*,²⁸ Cont. 14, JTr. 14; D.L. iv. 52, 63-4*; Philostr. VS i. 5; Sch. Luc. Symp. 12; Jul. Symp. 306b; Eust. in Hom. 1381.46, 1423.2*, 523.21-23; Sch. Hom. Il. xii. 175. 2 (the rhetorical use) *a* *quote* verse in prose *with partial prose paraphrase or with prose alterations to suit the new context*, Men. Rh. IX, 282.24 (Walz)*, Jo. Sic. in Hermog. ii. 31 (VI, 400.16 [Walz])*; Sch. D. xix. 245, Sch. Luc. Alex. 53, Olymp. in Phd. 68c-69c (48.20 [Norvin]), 70b (56.6-10 [N.]), in Alc. I 113c (104 [Creuzer])*; 119c (147[C.]), 132a (221[C.]); Procl. in Alc. 113c (291 [C.])*; Hermias in Phdr. 241d (61.9 Couvreur); Sch. Pl. Phdr. 241d, Alc. 113c, 132a, Rep. 544d. *b* *more generally, adapt, borrow or plagiarize* an idea or phrase from prose or verse, Philostr. VA i. 30; Doxopater II, 558 (Walz), Syrian. in Hermog. 113.6 (II, 9.19 [Rabel])*; Olymp.

in Phd. 67c (43.15-20 [Norvin]), 70c (58.13 [N.]), in Mete. ii. 1 (353a34)*; Simp. in Ph. iv. 1 (208a29); Procl. in Cra. 394e (87. 42 [Pasquali]); Sch. Aristid. Comm. Apol. pro Quat. 245, 402b (268 [Frommell]); Sch. Pl. Symp. 218b (Arethas). II. *make a pun on a word*, Sch. Luc. Tim. 54.

Construction.—c. acc. of original passage, Sch. Pl. Phdr. 241d, Alc. 113c*, 132a; Syrianus in Hermog. 113.6; Olymp. in Phd. 67c*, etc.; pass. Sch. Pl. Rep. 544d; c. acc. of new passage, ἀπό or ἐκ c. gen. of original or source, Sch. Luc. Tim. 54*; Sch. Plat. Symp. 218b; so chiefly in the passive, Ath. viii. 364b, Philostr. VA i. 30, Sch. Ar. Pl. 253*, etc.; abs. Jul. Symp. 306b*; Eus. PE x. 3*, etc.

παρωδή, ἡ, 1. = *παρωδία* I. Ath. ii. 54e; cf. xiv. 638b. 2. = *παρωδία* II, 2. Olymp. in Alc. I 113c (104 [Creuzer]). 3. *literary imitation* in general, Quint. Inst. ix. 2. 35, Ath. xiv. 638b; = *προσωποποιία* I. Phld. Hom. 53 (Olivieri). (xvii. 31). Cf. *παρωδέω* I. 2b.

παρωδία, ἡ, I. *A poem of burlesque or parody in Homeric style, mock-epic*. Arist. Poet. 2. 3 (1448a 12-13)*; Ath. i. 5a-b, ii. 64c, iii. 73d, ix. 406e, 407b, xiv. 656e, xv. 698b-699a; D.L. ix. 111*, Eust. in Hom. 1720.61. II. *The use of quotation, paraphrase or adaptation according to the various methods indicated under παρωδέω*. 1. According to *παρωδέω*, I, 1a, Sch. Ar. Ach. 8*, 119, Eq. 214, 1290, Nu. 138, Av. 1247, Hsch. s.v., cf. Don. in Ter. Eun. iii. 5.42; limited by Quint. Inst. vi. 3. 97* to the use in prose of verses composed in imitation of familiar ones (i.e., without verbal borrowing). 2. According to *παρωδέω* I, 2a. Hermog. Meth. 30*, Greg. in Hermog. Meth. 30 (VII, 1321 [Walz]), Sch. D. xix. 245; Ps. Ascon. in Cic. Verr. Act. I. 29. III. *Pun, word-play*. Hermog. Meth. 34*. Greg. in Hermog. Meth. 34 (VII, 1337 [Walz]).

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

²⁸ Passages marked with an asterisk would be quoted in full in an ideal lexicon. Most of them have been quoted during the course of this paper and so are not repeated here.

VESPASIAN'S SPICE MARKET AND TRIBUTE IN KIND

HELEN JEFFERSON LOANE

THERE is some reason for believing that Vespasian helped to balance an alarmingly deficient budget by engaging in state trade, and there is the added possibility that he established at Rome the *Horrea Piperataria*—a warehouse for the reception and sale of Eastern spices and perfumes. Since evidence for imperial interest in trade and commerce is rare for the first two centuries, the probable erection of the *Piperataria* by the state in this emperor's reign—or even in the first century—is noteworthy. Closely linked with this special problem of state interest in trade is the vexed question of tribute in kind: How much and what types were exacted? How and by whom were they redistributed? Again, though the organized system of *natura* in the third century has always suggested an earlier beginning and development, little is known about this form of tribute in the early Empire. Perhaps a discussion of the Spice Market can supply material for the solution of both these problems.¹

The other official warehouses for special products known to us (the *Horrea Chartaria* and the *Horrea Candelaria*) belong in all probability to the time of the Severi, or even later, when the return to a natural economy brought with it increased exactions of tribute in kind.² The Spice Market, however, belongs to another era. The chronographer of the year A.D. 354 states that Domitian completed the hor-

rea in A.D. 21,³ and this testimony receives indirect support from a passage in Galen (xiv, pp. 64 and 79 K.) describing activities established there in Trajan's day.⁴ Moreover, from archeological evidence it is possible not only to confirm this dating but even to go back a few years. The suggestion has been made that the *Horrea Piperataria* belong to the period immediately following Nero's death, when the thrifty Vespasian restored to more profitable uses the famous pleasure portico along the Sacred Way.⁵ The apparent contradiction between this earlier period and the year set by the chronographer is not insurmountable, for quite possibly the completion of the market required a number of years and the actual dedication, as the chronographer states, was reserved for Domitian.

In view of Vespasian's interest in increasing fiscal revenues by commercial projects, which we know from other sources, the attribution of the *Piperataria* to him is highly probable. According to Suetonius (*Vesp.* 16), even after Vespasian became emperor, he was so greatly interested in all possible sources of revenue that he would buy up certain commodities merely to distribute them at a profit:

¹ "Chronica minora," *MGH*, I (1842), 146.

² Dio (lxxii. 24) reports the destruction of a warehouse near the Sacred Way, probably the *Piperataria*, during the fire in Caracalla's reign.

³ See E. B. Van Deman, "The Neronian Sacra Via," *AJA*, XXVII (1923), 425. Since the last years of the republic the Sacred Way had been the business locale of dealers in pearls and other jewels, and after the Augustan building program the row of small shops on the north side was surmounted by a structure in some respects like the later horrea. In A.D. 64 Nero built a portico, which, though intended primarily for strolling, offered merchants an attractive place to expose their wares (*ibid.*, pp. 383-424; *MAAR*, V [1925], 115-26). See also H. Bloch, *I Bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana* (Rome, 1938), pp. 76-77.

¹ The Spice Market has been treated very briefly in the author's *Industry and Commerce of the City of Rome* ("The Johns Hopkins Studies in History and Political Science," Vol. LVI, No. 2 [1938]).

² See below; also S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (Princeton, 1936), p. 444, for a useful bibliography. N. Lewis (*L'Industrie du papyrus dans l'Egypte gréco-romaine* [Paris, 1934], p. 140) indicates that the tendency was evident as early as the late Antonines.

"Negotiationes quoque vel privato pudendas propalam exercuit, coemendo quaedam tantum ut pluris postea distraheret." To Vespasian such activities did not appear especially unbecoming, since the aristocratic disdain for commercial enterprise was neither born nor bred in him. His grandfather had been an auctioneer's assistant; his father, a tax farmer (*ibid.* 1), and he himself had overcome the poverty resulting from an honest governorship by trading in mules.⁶ The Alexandrians, notorious for their ability to apply nicknames, claimed that he could not learn how to act the Caesar and persisted in dubbing him the "Salt-Fish Dealer"—a title given to one of their own kings who was unusually stingy (Dio lxvi. 8; Suet. *op. cit.* 19).⁷ Yet the parsimony and unimperial behavior evident during his reign undoubtedly arose from Vespasian's determination to put the finances of government on a sound footing. Suetonius (*ibid.* 16) tells us that at the beginning of his administration he made the pronouncement that he needed forty billion sesterces to set the affairs of state in order. Though the large amount of the deficit has often been questioned⁸ and various justifications offered for its size at this time,⁹ it is certain that the state was in desperate need. As a consequence, old revenues

were renewed, tribute from the provinces was increased, and various new forms of taxation were introduced. In the light of this precarious state of the imperial budget, Suetonius' statement about the emperor's buying and selling of commodities deserves scrutiny, since it suggests that the transactions may well have been directed, not toward personal, but toward fiscal, advantages.

Suetonius and the other authors give no further information about such traffic, but there are a few indications that point toward a special interest, at this time, in wares that came from the East. The elder Pliny, a member of Vespasian's "cabinet" as commander of his fleet, gives some figures about the amount of this Eastern commerce. He had gathered the information, possibly from records of port dues in fiscal archives, that each year over a hundred million sesterces were drained from the Empire into India, China, and Arabia (*HN* xii. 84). Of this amount, over half (fifty-five million sesterces) was sent to India for spices, ointments, and gems.¹⁰ This adverse balance called forth Pliny's best moralizing tirades; and it is not difficult to believe that they were, to some extent, a reflection of the harrassed emperor's own attitude. Certainly, here was a situation that demanded inquiry. And there is, in fact, rather striking proof that Vespasian studied the problem and took measures to remedy it, for after Nero's reign the number of gold and silver coins from the Empire found in India shows a marked decline.¹¹ In place of hoards con-

⁶ Suet. *Vesp.* 4. See the discussion in G. W. Moonney, *C. Suetoni Tranquilli De vita Caesarum libri vii-ix* (New York, 1930), p. 391. Some scholars have believed that Vespasian hired out mules for transport purposes; others that he was an itinerant merchant: cf. Ventidius Bassus.

⁷ See also M. P. Charlesworth, *CAH*, XI, 2 ff.

⁸ For the older bibliography see Mooney, *op. cit.*, pp. 441-42; also Charlesworth, *op. cit.*, p. 13; M. Cary, *A History of Rome* (London, 1935), p. 625, n. 7; L. C. West, *Gold and Silver Coin Standards in the Roman Empire* ("Numismatic Notes and Monographs," No. 94), p. 67.

⁹ See the discussion in T. Frank, *Rome and Italy of the Empire* (*An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, Vol. V), p. 45. It is suggested here that the statement was made to justify the transfer of properties belonging to the Julio-Claudian *patrimonium* to the *fiscus*. A list of expenses, however, is given in the following sentences.

¹⁰ *HN* vi. 101. See Wallace (*op. cit.*, p. 255), who makes the plausible suggestion that this sum represents the total on which customs were levied at the Red Sea ports and includes trade with Arabia and Ethiopia. Pliny also knew that, largely because of transport charges, these Indian wares cost one hundred times more in Roman markets than in Indian ones.

¹¹ E. Warmington, *The Commerce between the Roman Empire and India* (Cambridge, 1928); for a discussion of gold coins see p. 280; for silver, p. 285; for

sisting of over a hundred gold pieces, groups of six or less occur from the time of Vespasian on; moreover, there is a corresponding decrease in the outflow of silver. It may well be that the first Flavian made a successful attempt to check the flow of specie eastward.

There is no need to conclude, however, that this decrease in the exportation of gold and silver entailed a check in Rome's trade with the East, since there is other evidence of its survival and even of its increase. Instead, it seems likely that now more exports from the Empire were made in bulk and that barter became increasingly more important.¹² This was merely the renewed application of an earlier policy, for evidence shows that some of this trade had always been in commodities: Pliny (*HN* xix. 7) states that Egypt purchased many of her Eastern wares by means of flax; first-century ostraca from Coptos show that trade with India was often in bulk;¹³ and it is clear from the *Periplus* that many Egyptian wares went to Eastern ports. Since most of the Indian articles, as well as wares from all parts of the Empire, came to the entrepôt of Alexandria, the point at which imperial interests could best control the traffic eastward and even westward was apparently Egypt. It may be noted here that, at a later date, the pretender Firmus made capital of this situation by shipping large quantities of Egyptian papyrus and glue to India in return for more exotic articles (*S.H.A. Firmus* 3). It is quite possible, too, that Vespasian, who understood conditions in

Egypt, was able to make good use of this exceptional opportunity.

By attributing the Spice Market to Vespasian we have implied a special interest in the ointments and perfumes, usually of Indian origin, that were prepared for world use at Alexandria. Perhaps it would be well at this point to touch briefly on conditions of production there and try to determine to what extent this production could supply the emperor with a new source of revenue. From Hellenistic times many of the factories of Alexandria had been engaged in processing spices and unguents for a wide market, and Pliny's description (*HN* xii. 59) of the *officinae* for the making of frankincense (where strict precautions were taken against theft by the many workmen), revealing, as it does, the value of the trade, posits large capital investment and large-scale enterprise. Under the Ptolemies the monopolistic organization of the ἀρώματα had provided conditions necessary for the operation of such large-scale enterprises, but it is generally conceded that these conditions were altered by the Romans.¹⁴ Although the evidence for the nature of this modification is slight and rather conflicting, it may reasonably be assumed that there was at least the residue of a monopoly in the perfume trade. Some spices and perfumes probably continued to be produced in state factories,¹⁵ while others came from private workshops, permitted by the state to exist in controlled form.¹⁶ As in the

Vespasian's policy, p. 293. The cessation of complaints about the drainage of Roman coinage to the East after Vespasian's time may have additional bearing on the problem. That some silver bullion was still traded at Coptos, however, apparently for Indian wares, in A.D. 117 is shown by *P. Giss.* 47 (see A. C. Johnson, *Roman Egypt [An Economic Survey, Vol. II]*, p. 444).

¹² Warmington, *op. cit.*, pp. 293-94.

¹³ See Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 381.

¹⁴ See M. Rostovtzeff, *A History of the Hellenistic World*, pp. 313 ff.; Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 339-40; F. Heichelheim, "Roman Syria," in *An Economic Survey*, III, 228-29; M. Rostovtzeff, *Seleucid Babylonia* ("Yale Classical Studies," Vol. III [1932]), pp. 3-114; Wallace, *op. cit.*, pp. 181 ff.

¹⁵ Pliny's description of the frankincense factory (*HN* xii. 59) hints at state interest. See F. Heichelheim, "Monopol," *P.-W.*, XVI, 195. Perhaps we should even recall Strabo's statement (xvii. 1. 13) about government monopolies as a source of revenue under Augustus.

¹⁶ We do know from *P. Fay.*, 93 (see Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 386) that the government (in A.D. 161) granted

former salt monopoly of the Seleucids at Palmyra, the main feature of the reorganization seems to have been a monopoly on sales.¹⁷ This system, combining state-controlled individual enterprises with some modified monopolies, would enable the emperor to control industrial ventures of no small scale. Herod of Judaea could offer him a successful model.

There is still another point to be made about state-controlled factories under Vespasian. It is evident that, with Augustus' reorganization of Egypt, many of the Ptolemaic factories went the way of Cleopatra's famous woolen mill—they were leased to private concerns. Yet it would be thoughtless, especially in view of Pliny's frankincense factory, to imply that all were removed from imperial hands. Later, with the establishment of a new dynasty under Vespasian, the status given to old enterprises by Augustus and his successors may well have been changed and the number of state ventures increased. To illustrate this change in status we may consider a piece of evidence for the production of papyrus in the Fayûm. When the properties of Julia Augusta and the sons of Germanicus in the Fayûm passed from the *patrimonium* to the *fiscus*, the monopoly of the production of papyrus (which, in all probability, had existed along with a monopoly of sales in this area) passed from the personal control of a member of the ruling house, and thus of a private entrepreneur, into the control of the *fiscus*.¹⁸ We assume this, because in

the reign of Domitian a soldier was assigned to the Fayûm *ad chartam conficiendam*.¹⁹ His job may or may not have been to supervise a state shop. At any rate, the emperor and his fiscal advisers are concerned with papyrus production on this former private estate, and there is no reason to doubt that this process of transference from private to state control occurred elsewhere in similar circumstances.

Analysis of the degree of imperial interference in the spice trade is complicated by the difficulty of interpreting the legend on the clay seals, probably from Alexandria, which reads: ἀρωματικῆς τῶν κυρίων Καυσάρων.²⁰ Warmington concludes that the seals were attached to tribute in kind;²¹ Johnson suggests that the inscription implies that taxes in kind, which had been imposed by the state in Upper Egypt, were sold locally by the government;²² and Heichelheim states that products from factories leased by the state were marked thus to guarantee the fulfillment of governmental requirements.²³ This last interpretation has much to commend it. Unfortunately, nothing more, not even the date of the seals, is known, and it is therefore impossible to be certain of their exact use. The use of the plural form of Caesar, however, strongly hints at joint rule and thus a date in the third century. Certainly by this time perfumes and spices, either as tribute in kind from state-controlled private enterprises or,

¹⁹ *Pap. Gen. Lat. I*, recto llc.; Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 673–75.

²⁰ *IGRR*, I, 1375–76; cf. Heichelheim, "Monopol," p. 195.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 390; also A. Persson, *Staat und Manufaktur im römischen Reiche* (Lund, 1923), pp. 19, 36–37.

²² *Op. cit.*, p. 331.

²³ "Monopol," p. 196. See also Rostovtzeff in *Arch. für Pap.*, IV (1908), 315, who declares that the seals show an imperial monopoly, though the perfumes themselves may have been produced by private lessees. A. Schmidt (*Drogen und Drogenhandel im Altertum* [Köln, 1924], p. 90) suggests that these products from Alexandrian shops were sent to Rome for the use of the imperial palace, tax exempt.

to an individual the concession to produce and sell perfumes in the Fayûm, and, incidentally, that this individual had the right to sublet the concession. In addition, the high capitation tax on dealers in perfumes and ointments is well attested (see Wallace, *op. cit.*, pp. 108, 208–9).

¹⁷ Heichelheim, "Roman Syria," pp. 228–29; Wallace, *op. cit.*, pp. 108, 208–9; Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 328 (for changes made in the Ptolemaic oil monopoly).

¹⁸ See Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 329; Frank, *op. cit.*, pp. 45–46.

more likely, as the final product of imperial factories, were coming directly to the state; and it is not at all improbable that this practice had its origin in an earlier period.

Without discounting the part played in this traffic by state factories, some emphasis must of necessity be placed on the other possibility that spices, perfumes, and ointments came into fiscal control as tribute in kind and passed thence to their final destination in the Horrea Pipertaria. In Egypt more than in any other province of the Empire, tribute in perfumes is a possibility, for there is every reason to believe that the principle of *natura* was, under certain circumstances, always operative there. The unique system of taxation worked out for the land in an earlier period had forced the Roman conquerors to adopt a special policy toward it.²⁴ In addition, we know from instances in other provinces that the Roman state never hesitated to exact its taxes in kind when it felt that it was advantageous to do so. Mention need only be made of the silphium from Cyrene found stored in the Aerarium by Caesar (Pliny *HN* xix. 40) and the tribute of Spanish kermes cited by Pliny (*ibid.* ix. 141) to show this practice. In Egypt, moreover, sporadic requisitions of *natura* for special purposes were made even during the first century; and later, when expediency demanded, they were widely extended and organized.²⁵

The possibility exists, moreover, that as early as the reign of Domitian glass from Alexandrian factories, presumably as a form of tribute, was sent with other

wares belonging to the fiscus to the imperial official *a rationibus*. This glass is mentioned in a famous passage from Statius (*Silvae* iii. 3. 86-95), in which are enumerated the products over which this official, no longer a mere purveyor for the emperor's palace, had control:

iam creditur uni
sanctarum digestus opum partaeque per omnis
divitiae populos magnique impendia mundi.
quidquid ab auriferis eiecat Hiberia fossis,
Dalmatico quod monte nitet, quod messibus
Afris
verritur, aestiferi quidquid terit area Nili,
quodque legit mersus pelagi scrutator Eoi,
et Lacedaemonii pecuaria culta Galaesi
perspicuaeque nives, Massylaque roborata et
Indi
dentis honos: uni parent commissa ministro.
...²⁶

Now is entrusted to one man the control of the sacred treasury: riches derived from every race, the revenue of the great world. Whatever Iberia casts up from her gold-bearing mines, the metal that glitters in the Dalmatian hills, the garnered harvests of Africa; all that is threshed on the floors of the torrid Nile, or gathered by the divers who search the Eastern sea, the tended flocks of Lacedaemonian Galaesus, frozen crystals, Massylian citrus wood, the valued tusks of India: everything is entrusted to his sole charge. . . .

Although there is some difference in the interpretation of individual items, there is a general agreement that the following articles are listed: Spanish and Dalmatian gold, African and Egyptian wheat, pearls from Eastern seas (probably the Persian Gulf), wool from Tarentum,

²⁴ See F. Vollmer's edition of the *Silvae*, pp. 414-15; Rostovtzeff, "Fiscus," *DE*, III, 136; Mommsen, *St. R.*, II*, 1106; Friedlaender, *Sitteng.*, I*, 53 ff. It is generally assumed on the bases of Pliny (*HN* xxxvii. 23 and 26) that *perspicuae nives* refers to glass. The possibility that it was imported from Alexandria is supported by Kisa (*Das Glas im Altertum*, pp. 173-74). There may even have been a monopoly in Alexandrian glass production (Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 134 and 136). For a discussion of the official see Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsbeamten*, pp. 30-31; A. M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 184-85.

²⁴ See Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 281-90, 537, 620-34; Wallace, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-30, pp. 214-19.

²⁵ Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*, pp. 503-4, n. 57, 536; Lewis, *op. cit.*, p. 140, n. 2, also p. 144; Wallace, *op. cit.*, pp. 214 and 444; D. van Berchem, "L'Année militaire dans l'empire romain au III^e siècle," *Mémoires de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France*, X (8th ser.; 1937), 117-202.

glass, citrus wood from Mauretania, and ivory from India. It must be admitted that this poetic description cannot be forced into a tribute list; yet the selection of gold and grain to head the enumeration (both of which by this time came as tribute to the fiscus)²⁷ may help to define the status of the other items. In addition, we know that wool, which apparently came from imperial estates near Tarentum,²⁸ was at the time of the publication of the poem no longer being sent to the *patri-monium* but as tribute to the fiscus.

The inclusion in this grouping of pearls, ivory, and citrus wood²⁹ is more difficult to explain, though it is possible that they, too, were either offered as tribute or exacted as duty on the borders of the Empire. Romanelli's statement³⁰ that the ivory was tribute—a suggestion supported by finds of tusks in fiscal storerooms (the Horrea Galbana)³¹—cannot be taken as final, as another more likely source for these tusks can be found.³² Yet the silphium from Cyrene, the Spanish kermes, and the wax from the Sanni (see below) remind us that the state could, and often did, collect its taxes in kind.³³ Thus it is

not improbable that we are dealing here with a list of tribute products and that along with wheat and gold we may place ivory, citrus wood, and the glass of Egypt.

At this point the attitude adopted by the government toward tribute from Alexandrian perfume or glass "factories" may be more closely defined by examining the relation of the fiscus to another valuable Egyptian export—papyrus. Pliny's account of a private manufactory at Rome owned by Fannius in the time of Augustus (*HN* xiii. 75) and his story of the senate's intervention in the distribution of papyrus during the reign of Tiberius (*ibid.* 38) make it clear that at the beginning of the Empire the sale of paper at Rome was but slightly, if at all, regulated by fiscal authorities.³⁴ Yet in the third century we find at Rome the Horrea Chartaria,³⁵ from which, it would seem, the state sold or distributed the annual tribute received each year from Egypt. At some time, then, between these two widely separated dates, a vital, if gradual, change in policy took place.

The first mention of paper as part of the annual tribute, ἀναβολικόν (*L. anabolicum*), comes during the reign of Aurelian (*S.H.A. Aur.* 45): "vectigal ex Aegyptio urbi Romae Aurelianus vitri, chartae, lini, stuppae, atque anabolicas species aeternas constituit" ("Aurelian reserved tribute from Egypt in glass, paper, linen, and hemp for the benefit of the city of Rome, establishing it as a continuous

²⁷ See especially Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 236–37. For grain see Cardinali, "Frumentatio," *DE*, III, 308, based primarily on Aurelius Victor *Epit.* I. 5–6, and Josephus *Bell. Jud.* II. 383. For gold see Pliny *HN* xxxiii. 67 and 78, and Strabo III. 2. 10.

²⁸ Horace *Carm.* II. 6. 1, with Acro's note. See Vollmer, *loc. cit.*

²⁹ For citrus wood see R. Haywood, "Roman Africa" in *An Economic Survey*, IV, 55.

³⁰ This suggestion is, of course, a hypothesis; see R. Cagnat, *Etude historique sur les impôts indirects chez les Romains* (Paris, 1882), pp. 77–78. Dues on the Egyptian side of the Red Sea were leased to a contractor in Pliny's day (*HN* vi. 71–91); cf., however, the Roman official with a soldier in *Periplus* 19.

³¹ Made in *DE*, III, 865. There were found 675 cu. ft. of ivory.

³² It may be that much of this "state" ivory came from elephants slaughtered at the games (for numbers killed see Loane, *op. cit.*, p. 50, n. 176).

³³ E.g., clothing for armies in Spain was exacted in kind as early as the Hannibalic Wars (Van Nostrand, "Roman Spain," in *An Economic Survey*, III, 232). For the *annona militaris* see Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 544;

R. Oehler, "Annona militaris," *P.-W.*, I, 2320–21; van Berchem, *op. cit.*; Wallace, *op. cit.*, pp. 214 ff., 444–45.

³⁴ Since in Egypt the state probably retained some sort of monopoly on papyrus, Fannius undoubtedly secured his cheap paper from imperial agents. For the survival of the monopoly on papyrus see Wallace, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

³⁵ See *Notitiae regionum urbis XIV* (H. Jordan, *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum*, II [1871], 546) in Reg. IV, on the Esquiline.

yearly tax"). This mention of the tribute of paper need not, however, be coincident with its inauguration, since Aurelian's part seems to have been the conversion into *natura* of any part of the tax still paid in money, or possibly the reservation of these articles, formerly collected for the Roman army throughout the Empire, for the use of Rome alone.³⁶ Though the *anabolicum* was probably inaugurated in the first century to aid the Roman armies engaged in actual warfare and was later developed and extended by the Antonines and Septimius Severus, it is not clear whether the state used the tax directly, bartered it, or sold it to obtain money for supplies. With the establishment of the paper warehouse, probably in the time of the Severi, however, the state undoubtedly sold the Egyptian commodity directly to dealers.³⁷ This procedure may not be evidence for a similar policy established earlier at the Horrea Piperataria, but it affords an interesting parallel.³⁸

³⁶ Wallace (*op. cit.*, pp. 214-19 and 444-45) gives a complete bibliography and a summary of previous discussions of the problem. The earliest references to the ἀναβολικὸν occur in *O. Fay.*, 49 (A.D. 197) and in the edict of Tl. Julius Alexander (*OGIS*, 669. 21 [A.D. 68]; cf. Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 704 ff.). The leaden seals marked *anabolici* date from the time of Severus on (Rostovtzeff, *Röm. Mitt.*, XI [1896], 317 ff.). In the time before Aurelian, when the ἀναβολικὸν was assessed for the army, the products may not have been the same as the four mentioned by Vopiscus. If they were, it is possible that the articles not of use to the army were bartered for supplies or sold to obtain revenues. The ἀναβολικὸν mentioned in the edict of Tl. Julius Alexander may have been for Vespasian's campaign against Jerusalem, begun in A.D. 67.

³⁷ Lewis, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-44; cf. above, n. 36.

³⁸ For linens sent to Rome as tribute from governmental shops at Alexandria (see Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 332) or exacted from private weavers elsewhere (for requisitions from weavers for the Roman army see Persson, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-40) there is no evidence in the city beyond the fact that a bazaar, where clothing was evidently sold, was erected some time before 12 B.C. by Augustus' friend and adviser, Agrippa. From these Horrea Agrippiana, built in all probability to increase the sales facilities of the capital, the inscriptions of several clothiers have come to light. They include C. Iulius Lucifer (*CIL*, VI, 9972), an imperial freedman, and M. Livius Hermeros with his wife, Claudia Tl. f. Moschis (*ibid.*, XIV, 3958), herself undoubtedly the offspring of an imperial freedman. These former

Evidence for the disposal of tribute sent to Rome is meager and scattered. For example, concerning the Horrea Candelaria—a warehouse for storing wax, possibly built by governmental agencies—there are two known facts. In the first place, the name appears on a fragment of the Marble Plan, indicating that the building was in existence at Rome in the time of Commodus;³⁹ then, again, wax paid to the state as tribute by the Sanni, a Pontic tribe, is mentioned by Pliny (*HN* xxi. 77). Though it is not necessary to conclude with Romanelli that the Horrea Candelaria were built by the fiscal authorities to receive the Pontic wax tribute⁴⁰ (since the storeroom probably dates from a period after Pliny's time), the method of taxation illustrated by this wax, as by the Cyrenian silphium and the Spanish kermes, has some bearing on our problem. The existence at Rome of a warehouse for this special product, evidently tribute, has even more bearing.

There is another passage in the ancient sources dealing with wares owned by the fiscus; and, although it offers little support to a theory that government officials interfered directly with the distribution of these materials at Rome, it does show that these officials engaged actively in trading, if not in the capital, at least in other parts of the Empire. In describing the balsam plantations of Syria, now a monopoly of the Roman government, Pliny (*HN* xii. 113) makes this interesting observation: "seritque nunc eum fiscus

imperial slaves may have begun their career as *vestiarii*, possibly distributing wares in which the imperial house was interested. Compare the career of the former imperial slave who later became both president of the carpenters' guild and contractor for state buildings (*ibid.*, VI, 9034).

³⁹ The *Forma urbis Romae regionum XIII* (ed. by Klepert and Huelsen, 1896)—a ground plan of the city made at the order of Commodus following the great fire—shows these horrea on Frag. 53.

⁴⁰ In *DE*, III, 969. Cf. tax in kind on wax in Egypt (Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 556, 558).

nec umquam fuit numerosior" ("At the present day the reproduction of balsam is the duty of the fiscus, and the plants were never more numerous"). He continues (*ibid.* 123): "Nec manifestior alibi fraus. Quippe milibus denarium sextarii empti, vendente fisco trecentis denariis, veneunt; in tantum expedit augere liquorem" ("In no commodity are there more obvious frauds, for a sextarius of balsam, sold by fiscal authorities at three hundred denarii, is sold again for a thousand—so vast is the profit to be derived from increasing this liquid by adulteration"). Pliny also tells us that in the first five years of state control the fiscus had derived eight hundred thousand sesterces from the sale of the balsam cuttings alone, thereby suggesting a total revenue of many million sesterces. This revenue and these sales, it will be remembered, were at this time controlled by officials of the Emperor Vespasian.

The second passage cited above shows unequivocally that these officials sold the balsam to entrepreneurs, who, through fraudulent practices over a period of five years, had realized over 200 per cent on the deals (it is even possible that, after this profit had been uncovered, one of Vespasian's financial officers revised the sales price). The ancient authority would have greatly aided the problem under discussion if he had given the barest hint of where such transactions took place. As the passage stands, the fiscal authorities may have had their offices at Rome, perhaps in the Horrea Piperataria, and have dealt with wares that had been shipped to the capital for storage. It is possible, on the other hand, that the balsam at this time was not sent to Rome, for in the case of another fiscal monopoly in the early Empire it is clear that intermediaries came into possession of the material at its place of origin and themselves controlled its shipment. They were the *publicani*,

who bought the *minium* concession at Sisapo (Pliny *HN* xxxiii. 118, and Vitruvius *De arch.* vii. 9. 3-4).⁴¹ The privileges enjoyed by these intermediaries, however, had been granted during the Republic, and it is not difficult to believe that later they were absorbed by imperial procurators, who shipped the *minium*, as they did other rare articles, directly to fiscal horrea at Rome.⁴² By the Flavian period *minium*, and balsam as well, may have been sent directly to Rome for processing and sale. Noteworthy, too, is the fact that even during the period when *minium* was privately owned the officials of the fiscus kept a watchful eye on its sale, placing the ceiling at seventy sesterces the pound. Such supervision of price, and possibly of shipment, must also have existed for other products, as, for example, Sicilian alum and sulphur, generally regarded as belonging to the state.⁴³

The tribute that belongs primarily to the fiscus and about whose control and shipment we are best informed is, of course, grain.⁴⁴ The Horrea Galbana, where approximately sixty-eight million modii of African, Egyptian, and Sicilian tribute grain would be received each year, had been built before the end of the Republic on land belonging to the Sulpician gens, but by the time of Augustus they were apparently considered public property and operated by the state.⁴⁵ A little over a quarter of the grain coming into the

⁴¹ See the commentary of W. Kroll, "Minium," in *P.-W.*, XV, 1848.

⁴² See Galen xiv, p. 64 and p. 79 K.; also Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 90. Galen is, of course, writing in the time of Marcus Aurelius, but he speaks of shipments of cinnamon by imperial procurators in the reign of Trajan.

⁴³ See Pliny *HN* xxxv. 174 and 184; also V. Scamuzza, "Roman Sicily," in *An Economic Survey*, III, 353 and 354.

⁴⁴ For a discussion of this problem see especially Cardinali, *DE*, III, 308.

⁴⁵ *CIL*, VI, 30855, speaks of a *horrearius* who was a freedman of Augustus. Cf. *Hor. Carm.* iv. 12. 17-18; see also P. Romanelli, *op. cit.*, p. 969.

warehouses went to the bureau of the annona for the dole;⁴⁶ so that after some fifteen million modii had been distributed to the citizenry—and a smaller amount to public servants and soldiers stationed at Rome—there was undoubtedly enough grain remaining to supply most of the needs of the home market. This situation kept the Roman market in a rather artificial condition, for, although a small amount was still barged down the Tiber by independent merchants, the state kept a watchful eye even on this tiny surplus. At Rome the maintenance of an adequate amount of grain at a fair price was one of the accepted functions of government.

There is little evidence in the early Empire for methods employed by the fiscus to accomplish these objectives or even to distribute the large amount of grain coming to it. Suetonius (*Aug.* 42) simply states that in a time of scarcity Augustus regulated the price of grain with no less regard for the interests of the farmers and the merchants than for those of the populace. Tacitus (*Ann.* ii. 87; xv. 39) says that both Tiberius and Nero interfered in the grain market; once, when prices had reached a high level, the dealers were paid a subsidy of two sesterces per modius to compensate them for selling at a lowered rate, and, again, after the fire of A.D. 64, a ceiling price of three sesterces the modius was established by the emperor. Such bonuses, offered in times of disaster when state grain was not immediately available, apparently kept independent traders from selling their cargoes at other ports; for, even if the amount of grain carried by them was small, any shortage at these times in the city's sup-

ply would be dangerous.⁴⁷ Another type of bonus was offered to the merchants who carried the tribute grain to Rome from Egypt, Africa, and other lands. To owners of vessels of a capacity of ten thousand modii the state granted indemnity from losses incurred while carrying out government contracts and, in addition, special exemptions and privileges of citizenship (Suet. *Claud.* 18-19). Apart from these inducements, little can be said about the control exercised by the fiscus over carriers or distributors of state grain before the time of Severus.⁴⁸

After the tribute grain had reached the fiscal warehouse and the annona had been served, the state was apparently content to allow intermediaries to dispose of the surplus to retail buyers. There are numerous inscriptions testifying to the number and importance of these *frumentarii* at Rome.⁴⁹ On the other hand, no inscriptions are concerned with trading activity in the state horrea, literary references are slight or of little value, and the archeological evidence is unenlightening.

Since so little is known about the sale or distribution of grain sent to state warehouses, it is well to examine the few details known about other produce stored there. First of all, Horace (*Carm.* iv. 12. 18) speaks of a wine cask reposing in the Horrea Galbana. Then, sherds of millions of amphorae for oil and wine have been found near by at Monte Testaccio, deposits of ivory as well as quantities of marble have been unearthed in this district in recent times, and (in an annotation to the verse of Horace) Porphyrio writes that in his day wine, oil, and other provisions were stored there. Yet Horace's famous cask probably came from a shop

⁴⁶ See the treatment of D. van Berchem, *Les Distributions de blé et d'argent à la plèbe romaine sous l'empire* (Geneva, 1939), pp. 22-23. The two hundred and fifty thousand male citizens on the dole received sixty modii annually. For details of this problem see Frank, *op. cit.*, 219-20.

⁴⁷ For evidence of these merchants see Frank, *op. cit.*, pp. 219-20; also Loane, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-23.

⁴⁸ Van Berchem, *Les Distributions*, pp. 96-116; see also Frank, *op. cit.*, pp. 268 f.

⁴⁹ See Loane, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-23.

rented from the state by a private dealer.⁵⁰ The amphorae of wine that were imported before A.D. 217 (and shattered to form Monte Testaccio) were clearly carried by independent entrepreneurs,⁵¹ the ivory "tribute" has been disposed of above, and Porphyrio's list belongs to the third century, when a changed economy undoubtedly filled the Galbana with tribute of more varied types. The finds of marble clearly indicate that great quantities of state-owned marble were sent to the capital.⁵² In general, this was used for imperial building projects, but some contractors and stone-cutters undoubtedly obtained a small supply from governmental officials. Details of sales, which probably took place in the fiscal storeroom, are lacking, but the volume of trade was of necessity slight. Thus, for the early Empire we know very little about the wares brought to the Galbana. In addition to grain, marble, and the precious metals,⁵³ we can only suggest that other tribute, as, for example, the items enumerated by Statius or even such rarities as the Lebanon cedars,⁵⁴ may have been brought here, but for this suggestion there is no proof.

The existence of great numbers of horrea at Rome,⁵⁵ many of them under fiscal control, raises the question of whether they, too, like the Galbana and later the Candelaria, Chartaria, and, shall we say, the Piperataria, served as repositories of tribute or as distribution centers for state goods. In the first place, it must be acknowledged that many of these structures were rented to independent merchants, as is shown by the *lex* (preserved in part) governing the leasing of various sections of the Horrea Nervae.⁵⁶ Then, again, most of the warehouses belonged originally to prominent families and passed slowly through the processes of inheritance and confiscation into governmental control, e.g., the Seiana,⁵⁷ Lolliana,⁵⁸ Volusiana,⁵⁹ Petroniana,⁶⁰ Faeniana,⁶¹ and Ummidi-

⁵⁵ Although the 290 horrea in the fourth-century catalogue include many safe deposit vaults made necessary by the years of anarchy, the number of warehouses and salesrooms was large.

⁵⁶ See above n. 49.

⁵⁷ The Seiana, built by Cicero's friend, the aedile M. Seius, were state property in the early Empire (CIL, VI, 9471; also 238).

⁵⁸ These horrea, built by some members of the gens Lollia, came into the hands of Livia (*ibid.*, VI, 4226), and in Claudius' time were grouped with properties of the emperor (*ibid.*, VI, 4239 and 4226).

⁵⁹ The Volusiana, originally the property of one of the Volusii (Q. Volusius Saturninus, according to Romanelli, *op. cit.*, p. 988) are not mentioned in the later period (CIL, VI, 7289 and 9973).

⁶⁰ These horrea became state property under Nero (CIL, VI, 3971). In the time of Commodus, or somewhat later, a Bithynian, M. Aurelius Xenonianus Aquila, had a *statio* in the Horrea Petroniana (SEG, IV, 106). From his name we may conclude that Aquila was either an imperial freedman or a native of Bithynia who had adopted the emperor's name. His boast that he was *πρῶτος λιμενάρχου* suggests the latter interpretation and apparently indicates that Aquila was successful in transporting marble for the state from the quarries of his native land. But the existence of a *statio* in the Petroniana, long before this an imperial warehouse, is perplexing, unless we may assume that state-owned marble was carried at times in private bottoms and stored in state warehouses. It is not impossible, moreover, that this importer had bought from fiscal authorities the right to dispose of some part of his cargo to individual enterprises.

⁶¹ These storerooms, probably built by L. Faenius Rufus, prefect of the annona in A.D. 55, were used for fiscal purposes.

⁵⁰ For shops around the horrea see *Forma urbis Romae antiquae, passim*; also CIL, VI, 33747. It is clear that many of the horrea were rented to independent merchants. Cf. the *lex* governing various sections of the Horrea Nervae (CIL, VI, 33747; see Bruns, *Fontes*, p. 371; and cf. CIL, VI, 33860); Romanelli, *op. cit.*, p. 986.

⁵¹ Frank, "Notes on Roman Commerce," *JHS*, XXVI (1906), 72-79.

⁵² E.g., at the time of the building of Trajan's Forum some fifty thousand tons of marble were imported within the space of a few years (A. Mau, *Röm. Mitt.*, XXII [1907], 189). Some of this marble undoubtedly came to the district of the Galbana, though most of it was put off on the wharf on the Campus Martius above the Aelian bridge.

⁵³ Since the time of Tiberius these had been fiscal property (Suet. *Tib.* 49).

⁵⁴ The state had established a monopoly on the cypress, spruce, firs, and cedars of Lebanon in the days of Hadrian (see F. Honigsmann, "Libanos," *P.-W.*, XIII, 7).

ana.⁶² For none do we know that the interest of the *fiscus* extended beyond revenues to be derived from their rental.

Certainly, if the state had any concern with the organized distribution of produce coming to the *fiscus* and stored in imperial horrea, indications of such organization should appear at the so-called Mercato, the great Roman market erected by the government along the eastern hemicycle of Trajan's Forum.⁶³ This structure contained about one hundred and fifty shops, apparently grouped into sections for the sale of special products, and also a lofty Aula Coperta similar in arrangement to the large auction-rooms found in Rome and many other cities of Italy.⁶⁴ Although it has often been stated that the market was built primarily to compensate independent dealers for being forced from their shops by imperial building programs (and the resemblance of booths in the Mercato to the familiar shops of Pompeii offered as proof of their private character),⁶⁵ evidence for the use made of this market is completely lacking. When a reference in a *Codex Vaticanus* to the "arcarii Caesaris qui in Foro Traiani habent stationes" was discovered, it was thought at first to apply to imperial agents engaged in marketing state goods or in distributing them on the dole.⁶⁶ As it became clear, however, that

these officials were stationed in the bankers' stalls down in the Forum itself and not in the market,⁶⁷ the one positive bit of evidence for imperial interest in the trade of the Mercato disappeared.

No reference to the Mercato has appeared in any of the more recent inscriptions from Trajan's Forum, but a marble slab found near the market, which records honors paid to one of the sons of Gallienus,⁶⁸ hints that at this period there may have been a link between the Mercato and the distribution of the city's tribute grain. Moreover, it has been shown that the Aula Coperta was the scene of distributions of food in the days of Constantine,⁶⁹ and a passage in the life of Commodus mentioning the bestowal of "congiaria in basilica Traiani" (S.H.A. *Com.* 2.2) has been interpreted as referring to this hall.⁷⁰ The question of whether this later use of the market by the government was derived from some earlier practice, possibly the storage or sale of state wares transferred from fiscal horrea, can be set if not answered.

An examination of the structures at Rome in which tribute and imports controlled by the *fiscus* could be stored or distributed has failed to contribute many details to the problem of tribute in kind. Nor has analogy clarified the function of the Piperataria. Two facts of importance, however, have emerged. There were at Rome other warehouses for the reception of special products—possibly tribute. Also, in the case of the two tribute products about which, because of their importance, we have most information—grain

⁶² Since a sister of Marcus Aurelius married into the gens Ummidia, it is likely that these horrea passed into the *patrimonium* soon after.

⁶³ See C. Ricci, *Via dell'Impero* (Rome, 1933), pp. 115–21; *Bull. Comm.*, LXI (1933), 253–57, and *Il Mercato di Traiano* (Rome, 1929); G. Lugli, "I Mercati Traianei," *Dedalo*, X (1930), 538; J. Carcopino, *La Vie quotidienne à Rome* (Paris, 1939), pp. 20–21, 320.

⁶⁴ A. Boëthius and N. Carlgren, "Die spätrepublikanischen Warenhäuser in Ferentino und Tivoli," *Acta archaeologica*, III (1932), 186 and 206.

⁶⁵ Boëthius, "The Neronian 'Nova urbs,'" *Corolla archaeologica*, p. 90.

⁶⁶ Lugli, *op. cit.*, p. 539. It was suggested that these officers of the *fiscus* received the wine, oil, and grain coming to the state, supervised their storage in the *cellae vinariae, oleariae*, etc., of the market, and supervised their distribution as *congiaria* or their sale at

reduced prices. Cf. Boëthius in *Roma*, IX, No. 10 (1931).

⁶⁷ See Ricci, *Via dell'Impero*, p. 117.

⁶⁸ *Not. Scav.*, 1933, 505.

⁶⁹ Boëthius and R. Riefstahl, "Appunti sul Mercato di Traiano," *Roma*, IX, No. 10e, 11–12; X, No. 4.

⁷⁰ Boëthius and Carlgren, "Die spätrepublik. Warenhäuser," p. 356.

and *minium*—the state clearly exerted itself to supervise sales and control prices. This supervision and control of prices may also have existed in the spice and perfume trade.

These practices had not been unusual at the capital, especially for luxury articles or for vital commodities,⁷¹ and from hints given by Pliny it seems likely that they were extended. This friend and counselor of Vespasian had been able to collect a considerable body of information about the definite value of individual spices and ointments.⁷² Not only does the detailed list raise speculations as to its source (Pliny, for instance, knows the price of four qualities of myrrh and four of nard), but the surprisingly small number of prices that show variation indicates rather clearly some form of regulation. It is not inconceivable that Pliny's knowledge of prices in Rome during his day came from wares displayed on the stalls of the newly erected Piperataria. If Vespasian had established state shops in the Piperataria, it would have been necessary for his *fiscus* to regulate prices both in these shops and in private shops as well. This may be the explanation of Pliny's list.

About the time that the Piperataria were built, a new road, the Via Domitiana, was constructed, which passed along the Sacred Way (and thus by the new horrea) and ended at Puteoli, still the port of call for Egypt and the East.⁷³ Perhaps it is nothing more than imagination to connect the construction of this shorter route with the new Spice Market and to picture an increasing number of vessels putting in at Puteoli, many of them laden with spices

and perfumes processed in Egyptian factories.

By the time of Galen, who had his office in the Piperataria during the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, imperial procurators were shipping rare drugs and spices directly to the horrea from all corners of the Empire. Some plants from near by came in daily consignments; others from distant lands arrived only during the summer. Although many of the drugs the court physician mentions were undoubtedly sent for the use of the imperial house, there is a strong likelihood that others came as tribute to the Spice Market to be sold.

The erection of the Horrea Piperataria at Rome on the Sacred Way, where later the basilica of Constantine was to stand, is an attested fact, and their erection in the period of the Flavians is also established. That Vespasian was in some way connected with this market seems highly probable. The need for money at the beginning of his reign, his interest in the adverse trade balance with the East, his previous experience in commercial enterprise, and the decrease of coin finds in India after this period—all these tend to link this emperor with the new horrea. Since, moreover, some state factories where oriental essences were manufactured into popular perfumes and unguents were apparently in operation at Alexandria during the early Empire and since, to judge from other products, even the tax on the privately owned perfume trade could at times be assessed in kind, vast sources of profit were at hand. So also was a large and wealthy group of consumers. Soon there were available adequate storage and sales facilities. Vespasian could undoubtedly find succor for a few of his difficulties in circumstances such as these.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

⁷¹ See above; also Suet. *Tib.* 34; *Iulius* 43.

⁷² See Pliny *HN* xii. The prices are collected and discussed by Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-17, 104-6; also by Warmington, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-28.

⁷³ See Warmington, *op. cit.*, p. 95; H. Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde*, II (Berlin, 1883-1902), 713. The road diverged from the Via Appia at Sinuessa.

THE ATTIC ASSOCIATION OF THE ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΟΙ

ROBERT SCHLAIFER

THE only information preserved concerning the Μεσόγιοι is found in their decrees inscribed on stone, three of which are preserved.¹ Although none of these documents, as now read, informs us directly of the nature of the association in which the Mesogians were joined, it has always been thought to have been a local league of the same sort as the Tetrapolis.² The only reason for this view is the name "Mesogians," "inhabitants of the Middle Land," which seems to indicate a territorial rather than a personal basis for membership.

In Attica there was one "Middle Land" or Mesogea³ par excellence, the central region of the three into which Cleisthenes had divided the country. This Cleisthenic constitutional term must certainly correspond to the common usage before the time of the politician. As long as Batê was the only deme to which Mesogians were known to have belonged and as long as this deme was not definitely located by other evidence, the league was naturally taken to have comprised all or part of the

Mesogea, and Bate was assigned to this district.⁴ But, as soon as the discovery of IG, II², 1247 brought the knowledge that there were Mesogians from Ceramicus and Cydatheneum as well, this original theory became untenable, for these demes are definitely known to have been located either within the walls of the city or in its immediate suburbs and, of course, belonged to the urban, not the Mesogean, trittyes of their tribes.⁵ Bate itself has now been assigned with good reason to this same region and to an urban trittys.⁶ Thus none of the four Mesogians whose demotics are known came from the Mesogea.⁷

Two solutions of this dilemma have been proposed. The first is to understand the name "Mesogians" as referring, not to the Mesogea, but to an "inland" region comprising at least the demes Bate, Ceramicus, and Cydatheneum, and perhaps others as well.⁸ The site of these demes would, it is true, have been correctly described by the adjective μεσόγειος, which

¹ IG, II², 1244, 1245, and 1247. For 1248, commonly attributed to the Mesogians, see below, p. 23, n. 15. The small fragment 1246 is also assigned in the *Corpus* to the Mesogians. S. Dow, however, has read an "erased" inscription on the same face of the stone and will publish a full account in a study of cult tables. The newly read text was inscribed by the same group of persons as 1246, and the new reading removes all support from the attribution of either inscription to the Mesogians.

² This theory was first advanced by Pittakys (*Eph.*, 1840, pp. 308-9) in his original publication of the first of these documents to be discovered (1245). For the best list of other leagues of this sort see Judeich, *RE*, "Attika," col. 2215, beginning l. 21; cf. Gilbert, *Jahrb. f. class. Philol.*, Suppl. VII (1874), 211-13; Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.*, II², 80-82; von Schöffer, *RE*, Δῆμος, col. 26, beginning l. 8; De Sanctis, *Atthis*², pp. 24-25.

³ Simply for the sake of clarity I have adopted the transliteration "Mesogian" for the association and "Mesogea" and "Mesogean" for the region.

⁴ This was the view of Pittakys (*loc. cit.*), accepted by E. Curtius, *Inscr. Att. nuper repert. xii* (Berolini, 1843), pp. 2-3; H. Dettmer, *De Hercule Att.* (diss., Bonn, 1869), pp. 38-39; A. Philippi, *Beitr. z. Gesch. d. att. Bürgerr.* (Berlin, 1870), p. 269; see also n. 7 below.

⁵ Judeich, *Topogr. v. Athen*², pp. 167, 172.

⁶ Milchhöfer, *RE*, s.v.

⁷ Overlooking this fact, various scholars have gone on repeating the theory which makes the Mesogians an association of inhabitants of the Mesogea: Judeich, *op. cit.*, col. 2215, l. 48; von Schöffer, *op. cit.*, col. 26, l. 39; De Sanctis, *op. cit.*, p. 25; cf. *Storia dei Greci*, I, 560; P. N. Ure, *Origin of Tyranny*, p. 39, n. 6; S. Solders, *Die ausserstädtische Kulte* (Lund, 1931), p. 112; Liddell, Scott, Jones, *Lex.*⁸, s.v.

⁸ This was the view of Koumanoudhis (*Ἀθήν.*, IV [1875], 113-14); it has been adhered to by Busolt, *op. cit.*, p. 81; Milchhöfer, *RE*, "Attika," col. 2187, l. 11; and E. Kornemann, *Staaten, Völker, Männer* ("Das Erbe der Alten," 2d ser., Vol. XXIV [Leipzig, 1934]), p. 37.

means nothing more than "at some distance from the sea" and which is used by Herodotus,⁹ for example, to designate the upper part of the Marathonian plain. Thus the interpretation of the name as "inlanders" is in itself quite possible. This interpretation, however, removes all reason for the view that the basis of the association was territorial, for, while "the inhabitants of the Mesogea," if the Mesogea is a known and definable region, might be thought to imply *all* the inhabitants of that region, a completely indefinite term like "inlanders" cannot imply all the inhabitants of any region whatever.

The other solution of this dilemma is to maintain the connection of the Mesogians with the Mesogea but to relegate it to the distant past. Membership in the league, originally dependent on residence in the Mesogea, might have become hereditary, so that descendants of Mesogeans who moved to Athens could still belong to the association. The fact that not merely some but all the Mesogians with known demotics come from the urban area may seem a remarkable trick of chance, since obviously not all the inhabitants of the region originally included in the league could already have moved into the city before the early part of the fifth century, when deme citizenship became hereditary, if, indeed, it had not already been made so by Cleisthenes in 507. This objection, however, would not be insurmountable. Once the original purpose of the league no longer existed, the great majority of the members might have become inactive, while a few friendly or related families, who happened to live in Athens, kept up the old traditions.¹⁰

The traditions worth maintaining

⁹ vi. 113.

¹⁰ This is apparently the view of Ferguson, *Hell. Athens*, p. 232 and n. 1.

would have been, first of all, the ancestral religious rites. Such traditional rites, performed in the ancient shrines, were the principal or sole activity of the Tetrapolis, the Tetracomis and the League of Athena Pallenis, the only local leagues whose activities are known. Therefore, it is to the cults of the Mesogians that we must look for confirmation or disproof of this hypothesis that the association, once rooted in the Mesogea, had later moved to Athens. The chief sanctuary of the Mesogians was clearly the Heracleum¹¹ in which they erected their inscriptions.¹² Since two of the three documents which name the Mesogians (*IG*, II², 1245 and 1247) were found quite near together a mile or so outside the Acharnian gate,¹³ the Heracleum was very probably located in this vicinity, as Koumanoudhis¹⁴ maintained. This site, however, was certainly part of an urban, not of a Mesogean, *trittys*.¹⁵ Thus, if the

¹¹ *IG*, II², 1247. 15; cf. 1244. 4.

¹² *Ibid.*, 1244. 3; 1247. 27.

¹³ They were found in what is now the quarter of Athens called Vathy, near the present asylum of St. Catherine (see Pittakys, *op. cit.*, pp. 307, 311; Koumanoudhis, *op. cit.*, p. 113; and for the identification of the places they mention, the Μεγάλη Ἐκκλησία, *VI* [1928], s.v. Βάθεια, p. 466bc).

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 114.

¹⁵ For a delimitation of the Mesogea which is at least a fair approximation see Löper's map, *Ath. Mitt.*, Vol. XVII (1892), Pl. XII. The most recent delimitation of the area of the urban *trittyes* is the map in A. W. Gomme, *Population of Athens* (Oxford, 1933).

The most recent discussion of the location of the Heracleum of the Mesogians locates it in the Mesogea by accepting the identification (first made by Köhler, *ad IG*, II², 604) of this sanctuary with the Ἡράκλειον ἐν κείῳ ἐν Χολαργίῳ of *IG*, II², 1248, and arguing that Cholaargus was a deme of the Mesogea (Hiller, *S. B. Berl.*, 1921, pp. 438-41). The only reason for identifying the Heracleum in Cholaargus with the Heracleum of the Mesogians is the fact that 1248 mentions hieromnemes, while the Mesogians are known to have had officials called mnemes (1247. 19). However, this variation in title in official documents of exactly the same period would be most unusual, and in any case the presence of (hiero)mnemes in connection with Heracles in two documents is insufficient reason to attribute them to the same cult, for hieromnemes are also found in Attica in connection with Heracles in Alopecce (*IG*, II², 1596. 5, which there is no reason to attribute, with Mommsen, *Feste*, p. 166, to Cynosarges) and in the genos of the Salaminii (*IG*, II²,

association had really been originally located in the Mesogea, the families who moved to Athens must have packed up the cult apparatus in their baggage and set up a new Heracleum on the first convenient plot of land near the city. Such an action would not only have been completely different from the policy of the other local leagues; it would have been incomprehensible, for to tear a cult from the holy land it had occupied since time immemorial was hardly a mark of greater piety than to abandon it altogether.

Improbability, nevertheless, is not disproof, and such a transfer might just possibly have taken place.¹⁶ The question is finally decided by the evidence of the second most important cult of the association, that of Diomus, who was apparently the only deity besides Heracles to be served by a special priest.¹⁷ This hero was the eponymus of the deme Diomea and

the son of Collytus,¹⁸ eponymus of the deme of that name. The latter deme lay within the city walls, the former just outside, and both belonged, of course, to the urban trittyes of their tribes.¹⁹ In legend Diomus was the founder of the Heraclea ἐν Διομείοις;²⁰ he is also the protagonist in one of the conflicting versions of the origin of the Buphonia, which, if his presence there is not due to a contamination,²¹ would connect him with the Acropolis itself. A hero connected so exclusively with the city can scarcely have been worshiped by a group of men living in the Mesogea. Nor is it any more likely that a group of Mesogean had founded a cult of Diomus after their removal to Athens. Cults were occasionally founded in historical times in honor of figures taken from mythology—the best example is afforded by the cults of the eponymous heroes of the ten Clis-thenic phylae, but these foundations were made for motives political rather than pious. Private associations chose as objects of their cults, when those cults were consciously founded and had not simply grown up, figures of greater religious effectiveness and more appeal to the imagination than these rather bloodless heroes.

This, then, is certain: the association was originally founded in the place it occupied in historic times, just outside the walls of Athens. Although the earliest rec-

1232. 18); cf. Ferguson, *Hesp.*, VII (1938), 64. Furthermore, both [1244] and 1247 refer to the shrine of the Mesogians simply as the Heracleum, whereas the author of 1248 felt a need to specify which Heracleum. And, indeed, it is most improbable that the Mesogians would have had more than one sanctuary of the same god.

Thus, if Cholargus was, in fact, a Mesogean deme, then the fact that the Heracleum of the Mesogians has been shown to have been located in an urban trittys should be considered final disproof of its identity with the Heracleum in a circle in Cholargus. Hiller (*op. cit.*, p. 440) misuses the evidence when he argues that the known provenience of 1245 and 1247 proves "nicht das geringste," but that the hearsay (Koumanoudis, *Ἀθήν.*, VIII [1879], 234, ad No. 3) provenience of 1244 from Kamatero confirms the location in Cholargus.

On the other hand, Gomme and Hommel, basing their conclusions on entirely different arguments, have returned to the view that Cholargus was an urban deme; and Meritt, in a note the knowledge of which I owe to the kindness of A. Raubitschek, has presented further evidence which seems to support this conclusion (*Hesp.*, IX [1940], 53–54, giving references to the work of Gomme and Hommel). If it is correct, then, while 1248 might conceivably be a decree of the Mesogians, they would so be only the more conclusively divorced from the Mesogea.

¹⁶ Ferguson (*Hell. Ath.*, p. 232 and n. 1) must have considered it possible, for he believed that the Heracleum was in an urban deme.

¹⁷ *IG*, II², 1247. 19.

¹⁸ Schol. *Ar. Ran.* 651; Hesych. *Διομείς*; Steph. Byz. and Suid. *Διόμεια*.

¹⁹ Judeich, *Topogr.*, pp. 169–70.

²⁰ This festival is mentioned in *Ar. Ran.* 651. For the etiology see the story taken from the *Συναγωγή*, s.v. *Κυρόραγες*, as preserved in Bachmann, *Anecd.*, I, 285, 11, Phot. and Suid. s.v. Cf. Hesych. and Steph. Byz. s.v.; schol. Dem. xlv. 114; and the variant version of the *Συναγωγή*, s.v. *εἰς Κυρόραγες*, preserved in Bachmann, *op. cit.*, I, 210, 30, Suid. s.v., and schol. [Plat.] *Asiarch.* 364a (p. 409 [Greene]). Mommsen (*op. cit.*, p. 160, n. 1) has proposed emendations for this latter version to bring it into better accord with the other.

²¹ Cook (*Zeus*, III, 593–95) discusses the problem and cites all the literature. All scholars agree in rejecting the version which makes Diomus a foreigner (*ibid.*, p. 590, n. 4).

ord of the association is from the end of the fourth century, the association and its cults are much older: Diomus is exceedingly archaic, and even Heracles was rarely if ever honored by the foundation of a new cult after the end of the seventh century.²² The association as such has no connection with the Mesogea; various explanations of the name "Mesogians" are possible, and none can be proved. The charter members may have wished to vaunt their descent from prosperous landholding aristocrats of the interior, or they may themselves have possessed property in the country while living among the greater amenities of their town houses; or, as Koumanoudhis thought, the name may have no connection with the specifically Attic sense of "Mesogea" and may signify simply "inlanders."

In any case the name throws no light on the nature of the association. Nor can this question be answered definitively by a general consideration of the association's constitution or of the sort of documents it issued. The most natural assumption from this general evidence would be that the Mesogians formed a club of the type common in Athens in later times and called by the generic term *κοινόν*. But this general evidence is by no means decisive, for, as will be shown, it accords equally well with an entirely different theory, while the evidence of the cults militates strongly against the view that the Mesogians were a mere club. The common sort of club is not found before the latter part of the fourth century, whereas the cults of the Mesogians seem to date at least from the sixth.

The only precise indication of the nature of the association is given by the one inscription in which it did not call itself simply *οἱ Μεσόγειοι* but gave itself its proper name. *IG*, II², 1244 is a stoichedon

inscription; the number of letters in each line is fixed with virtually complete certainty at 27 by the restorations of lines 1, 2, and 5. Lines 7-8 read τὰ ἐψ[ηφισμένα . . . ³ . . . τ]|ῶι Μεσογείων, and it would be extremely difficult to suggest any restoration for the lacuna except τῶι, followed by the proper term for the association. The restoration published in all the printed texts is τῶι κοινῶι, but this gives 28 letters in line 7 instead of 27. Koumanoudhis used this restoration as evidence for a 28-letter line; it has been retained in the 27-letter version of Wilhelm and his successors simply by error.²³ Consequently, unless one is to resort to the rather desperate measure of assuming the omission of a letter in the destroyed portion of this line,²⁴ there seem to be only two words of the right length which will make sense in this place: γένει and οἴκῳι.²⁵

The organization and constitution of the Mesogians accord at least as well with the hypothesis that they constituted a *genos* as with one which would see in them a mere *κοινόν*. At their head was an archon, the usual title of the head of an Attic *genos*,²⁶ and this archon, like those of the Salaminii, was charged with the *κρεανομία*.²⁷ Their finances were adminis-

²² A squeeze lent me by the kindness of Professor Meritt confirms the disposition of the preserved letters as printed by Kirchner: Wilhelm's majuscules (*Eph.*, 1905, p. 232) are not correctly arranged.

²³ It should, however, be pointed out that a letter was omitted in line 9.

²⁴ *ῥῆμα* is perhaps not absolutely impossible, but it is apparently never used to refer to a private association (see Poland, *Gesch. griech. Vereinswesens*, Index IV, s.v.).

²⁵ Töpffer, *Attische Genealogie*, p. 21; Kahrstedt, *Staatsgebiet*, p. 267. The archon of the Mesogians was elective (1247. 4) and held office for the term of a year (1245. 2). The term of office and method of choice for other gentile archons is unknown except in the case of the Salaminii, where presumably they held office for a year, since acts are dated by them (*Hesp.*, Vol. VII, p. 4, ll. 69, 73), but were probably chosen by lot (Ferguson, *Hesp.*, VII, 62-63).

²⁷ *κρεανομία* of the Mesogians (1245. 5). Of the Salaminii (*IG*, II², 1232. 16-17, as restored by Ferguson, *Hesp.*, VII, 62, cf. 63).

²² Cf. Ferguson, *Hesp.*, VII (1938), 43, n. 1.

tered by a tamias, an official known in the gene of the Amyndridae and the Eumolpidae.²⁸ Their herald corresponds to the heralds of the Salaminii²⁹ and the Euneidae,³⁰ as well as to those of the rather special genos of the Ceryces.³¹ Their mnemones are paralleled by the hieromnemes of the Salaminii.³² The pyrphorus is matched by the Ceryces' pyrphorus of the Graces and Artemis.³³ Only the *κορυγῶς* is unique among the Attic gene, but this title is equally unknown in organizations of all other sorts. Like the Salaminii,³⁴ they rewarded their deserving officials with a golden crown.³⁵ Even the name *Μεσόγειοι* is a perfect pendant to *Σαλαμῖνιοι*, for the latter had no more real connection with Salamis than the former with the Mesogea.³⁶

Of still greater significance, moreover, than these titles, which might be paralleled in the organization of the clubs, is

²⁸ Mesogians: 1247. 21 (third century B.C.); Amyndridae: *IG*, II², 2338. 10 (Augustan); Eumolpidae: *IG*, II², 1078. 39 (third century A.C.). Part of the revenue of the Mesogians apparently came from fees for the use of their agora (*τὸ ἀγοραστικόν*, 1245. 8: cf. Bultot, *Griech. Staatskunde*, I², 616, n. 1); the Salaminii likewise possessed an agora (*Hesp.*, Vol. VII, p. 3, l. 17; p. 10, l. 36; cf. Ferguson, *Hesp.*, VII, 55, 61 *init.*).

²⁹ *Hesp.*, Vol. VII, p. 4, l. 64; cf. Ferguson, *Hesp.*, VII, 61.

³⁰ *Poll.* viii. 103.

³¹ Roussel, *Mélanges Bidez*, p. 823.

³² *IG*, II², 1232. 18; cf. Ferguson, *Hesp.*, VII, 62, 64.

³³ Roussel, *op. cit.*, pp. 823-24.

³⁴ *IG*, II², 1232. 12.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 1245. 13; 1247. 11.

³⁶ Ferguson (*Hesp.*, VII, 15-20, 42-43, 45) has shown that the name of the Salaminii is pure propaganda. Nilsson (*AJP*, LIX [1938], 386-89) attempted to show that the ancestors of the Salaminii actually came from Salamis in a sort of exchange of populations with Athens, arguing that the granting of a subsidy by the state to the Salaminii (*Hesp.*, Vol. VII, p. 3, l. 20; p. 5, l. 87) indicates that this genos held a very unusual position. This subsidy, however, was a regular part of the normal treatment of the gene. It is well known that the great majority of the "public" rites were performed by gentile priests, and "public" rites by definition are those *εἰς ἃ θύματα δίδωσιν ἢ πόδας* (Hesych. *δημοτελὴ ἱερά*; Bekker, *Anecd.*, I, 240, 28; cf. *orac. ap. Dem.* xxi. 53). A subsidy to the Eumolpidae exactly like that to the Salaminii is recorded in *Hesp.*, Vol. IV (1935), p. 21, l. 73.

the fact that several of the Mesogians came from that class of substantial and prominent citizens who were usually members of gene, very rarely of *κοινά*. Amynomachus was one of the executors of Epicurus,³⁷ who was himself a gennetes of the Philaidae.³⁸ The great-great-grandfather of Epigenes³⁹ won several victories as choregus,⁴⁰ and his great-grandfather served as trierarch.⁴¹ The grandfather of Proclides⁴² is recorded as the proposer of a decree of the people.⁴³

One piece of evidence would appear to refute the conclusion that the Mesogians were a genos. Both the aunt and the daughter of the Mesogian Polyuctus⁴⁴ were priestesses of Athena Polias, and this priesthood belonged to the genos of the Eteobutadae.⁴⁵ Many a priesthood, however, came to be held by some man who was certainly a member of another genos than the one originally possessing the priesthood, whether or not he may have belonged to that one too.⁴⁶ Although no case of this sort is known before the middle of the second century,⁴⁷ this may be owing simply to lack of evidence for earlier times: already in 355 Isocrates⁴⁸ had mourned the extinction of many famous gene, whose public priesthoods can scarcely have been allowed to perish with them. Another possibility is that the genos of the Eteobutadae had split into two or more separate gene, one of which was that

³⁷ *Diog. Laert.* x. 16.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.

³⁹ *Stemma PA*, 10807.

⁴⁰ *IG*, II², 1138-39.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 1613. 208.

⁴² *PA*, 12200.

⁴³ *IG*, II², 354. 8.

⁴⁴ *Stemma ad IG*, II², 776.

⁴⁵ *Aeschin.* ii. 147; cf. *Töpffer, op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁴⁶ The most recent treatment of this long-debated problem of plural gentilitas is by Meritt (*Hesp.*, IX [1940], 91-96), who cites the earlier literature.

⁴⁷ Ferguson, *Hesp.*, VII, 52.

⁴⁸ viii. 88.

of the Mesogians. A division on a geographical basis existed in the genos of the Salaminii, and by the middle of the third century the two parts had been recognized as separate gene, . . . τὸ τε Σουνιέων καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξ Ἑπταφυλῶν.⁴⁹ The genos of the Mesogians might similarly have been formed of those Eteobutadae who lived farthest from the sea, or nearest to the (political) center of Attica, the city of Athens. The whole body of the Salaminii continued to function as a unit for certain purposes, although they were no longer known as a genos but simply as οἱ Σαλαμίνοι. Their most important priesthoods continued to belong to the two gene in common, although some members apparently had proposed to assign them to one group or the other.⁵⁰ Each of the two gene individually, however, had certain cults of its own.⁵¹ Similarly, while the public priesthoods of Athena Polias and Poseidon Erechtheus would have continued to belong to all the Eteobutadae in common, the cults of Heracles and Diomus could have belonged exclusively to the Mesogian genos.

If, nevertheless, the Mesogians were not a genos, then the only other possible restoration would make them an οἶκος. In

this context *oikos* might perhaps have the common meaning "household," a kin group smaller than a genos and capable of being part of one;⁵² the Mesogians would thus have been a subdivision of the genos of the Eteobutadae. Probably, however, the known Mesogians were too widely scattered geographically to be thought of as members of one household, and their organization seems very elaborate for so small a unit. The only other meaning of *oikos* occurring in Attica and suitable to this context is a subdivision of a phratry.⁵³ It would not be necessary to assume that all the Eteobutadae belonged to this *oikos* or even to the phratry of which it was a part, for members of one genos were sometimes distributed among several phratries.⁵⁴

In short, although the nature of the association of the Mesogians cannot be determined with complete certainty, it was clearly not a territorial league. And, unless a satisfactory substitute for γένει or οἴκῳ in IG, II², 1244, can be found, the association was equally clearly based on consanguinity, fictitious or real.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

⁴⁹ Wilamowitz, *Arist. u. Athen*, II, 266; cf. Ferguson, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-32.

⁵⁰ IG, II², 1237. 33 and 42. For references leading to the large literature on the nature of this οἶκος τῶν Δακεδαιῶν see Kahrstedt, *op. cit.*, pp. 233-34. οἶκος is also used, though not in Attica, to designate a mere club of late formation, in every case but one a club of merchants (Poland, *op. cit.*, p. 114); the exception is Kern, *Inscr. v. Magnes.*, No. 94, l. 6, on which see Wilhelm, *Beiträge*, p. 52. This meaning is excluded in the case of the Mesogians, first because it is non-Attic and, second, because of the early formation of the association, which has been shown above, p. 25.

⁵¹ Ferguson, *Hesp.*, VII, 28, n. 7.

⁴⁸ *Hesp.*, Vol. VII, p. 9, ll. 3 ff.

⁴⁹ Ferguson, *Hesp.*, VII, 50, ad ll. 8 ff.

⁵¹ The first arbitration, of 363 B.C., provided that what were then still the two halves of a common genos should possess in common the priesthoods of certain enumerated deities (*Hesp.*, Vol. VII, p. 3, ll. 8-12). The only possible reason for listing these cults instead of saying simply "all the priesthoods" must be that each group already had certain cults of its own. The arbitration of 250, which shows the two parts functioning as independent gene, says nothing about the priesthoods. Presumably, therefore, the regulations of 363 continued in effect.

DIPLOMATIC NOTES ON MICHIGAN OSTRACA*

HERBERT C. YOUTIE

I. BLANK FORMS

UNDER the general head of "Work on the Embankments," in a section labeled "Uncertain," the editor of the Michigan ostraca¹ from Karanis² has reproduced a number of texts of the third century A.D. which follow a common pattern: cleruchy number, personal name, date.³ These are now identified as acknowledgments of one day's labor on the canal embankments.⁴ They may be illustrated with a contemporary text from the unpublished resources of the collection.

INV. NO. 9790

ὁ Πεταῦς διακων⁵

2d hand (ἔτους) ε ὅθι τριακάδι.⁶

These lines indicate briefly but adequately that Petaus *diaconus*, a cultivator of land situated in the fourteenth cleruchy of

Karanis, did a day's work on Thoth 30 of the fifth year of an unnamed emperor in connection with the *corvée*.

Since almost the whole of the rural population was subject to this compulsory labor, numerous receipts were issued in the course of a season. It was convenient, therefore, to prepare in advance a large number of "blanks" in such manner that they contained the usual introductory formulas and only one or more additional items were needed to complete the receipt.⁷ For the type with which we are immediately concerned this procedure is amply attested in cases where the date is added by a second hand.⁸ Both "blank" and receipt are strikingly illustrated by two unpublished ostraca which bear the name of a certain Eutyches. They are contemporary with those published by Amundsen.

* [The Rackham School of Graduate Studies of the University of Michigan has contributed a part of the cost of printing this article.—EDITOR.]

¹ *O. Mich.*, I = Leiv Amundsen, *Greek Ostraca in the University of Michigan Collection*, Part I: "Texts" ("University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series," Vol. XXXIV [Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935]). In revising Amundsen's transcripts of the Askren Collection (Nos. 1-97) I have been able to study both the ostraca and a set of excellent photographs prepared by Mr. G. R. Swain. For the material recovered by the Michigan expedition to Karanis (Nos. 98-699) I have only the photographs, since the ostraca have been returned to the Egyptian Museum at Cairo. I have, as always, enjoyed the wholehearted co-operation of my colleague, Dr. O. M. Pearl.

² Now Kôm Aushim (Egypt).

³ *O. Mich.*, I, pp. 84-87. I have listed the publication numbers in *TAPA*, LXXI (1940), 630, nn. 35-36. Most of the numbers will be found below in n. 8.

⁴ *TAPA*, LXXI (1940), 630 f.; cf. *ibid.*, LXXII (1941), 442, 447.

⁵ Late form of *διακωνος*.

⁶ This line has been read by Pearl. For the significance of the second hand see n. 8.

⁷ See any of the following: Ulrich Wilcken, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, I (1901), 146; *P.S.I.*, IX, p. 80; *P. Goth.*, p. 7; *P. Princeton*, II, pp. 39 f.

⁸ The editor has noted a second hand in *O. Mich.*, I, 310 (corrected in *TAPA*, LXXII [1941], 447); but he has failed to note a similar change of hand in 303, 304, 306, 307, 313, 316, 318, and 320. In all these, a second hand—the same throughout—added the dates; and it is this hand which is responsible also for the dates in a number of receipts likewise published without distinction of hands in my notes on Michigan ostraca in *TAPA*, LXXI (1940), 630: Inv. Nos. 9332, 9500, 9983, and 10252, as well as in three ostraca published for the first time in the present paper: Inv. Nos. 9594, 9639, and 9790. In *O. Mich.*, I, 304, 306, and Inv. No. 9332 not only the second hands but the first also are identical, and the latter wrote the whole of Inv. No. 9609 (published *ibid.*, LXXI [1940], 631). In the same way, the first hand of Inv. No. 9639 wrote the whole of Inv. No. 9546 (published in Sec. I of this paper). In view of their paleographic homogeneity, the whole body of receipts was probably produced to meet the demands of a single inundation period. The only year mentioned is (ἔτους) ε in *O. Mich.*, I, 303, 304, and Inv. No. 9790, and this information is not sufficient for arriving at a precise date.

INV. NO. 9546

β Εὐτύχης
ἀπελ(εἰθερος) Δόγγου

2d hand

INV. NO. 9639

β Εὐτύχης Δόγγου⁹
Φαῶφι δευτέρα
καὶ εἰκάδι.

2d hand

The first hand of 9639 also wrote 9546, and the second hand is identical with the second hand in the other *corvée* receipts of this kind.¹⁰ Through the addition of the date, the second hand of 9639 converted a blank form into a receipt, but 9546 was never filled out and could not have been issued as a receipt.

Two more such "blanks," which may likewise be attributed to the third century A.D., have turned up in the collection. They are sufficiently brief to be given here.

INV. NO. 9514

ια
Σισοί(ς) Πιε¹¹

INV. NO. 9656

η Σεουηρῖνος¹²

"Blanks" of another kind are also preserved. These have the cleruchy number and the date, but a space is left for the name.

⁹ The omission of ἀπελθερος before Δόγγου can be only accidental, since 9639 corresponds to 9546 not only in the personal names but in the cleruchy number as well.

¹⁰ See n. 8.

¹¹ Although the ostrakon is broken on the right, its contour favors the view that no date followed the name. Below the name the ostrakon is blank. A Sisois, son of Petheus, is recorded in *P. Mich.*, IV, 224, 2575; 225, 2104, as an owner of garden land at Karanis on which taxes were paid in A.D. 172-74. The genealogy of an earlier Sisois, son of Petheus, resident at Karanis in A.D. 159-60, is presented by Carl Wessely, *Karanis und Soknopaiou Nesos* ("Denkschriften der kaiserl. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl.," Vol. XLVII [Vienna, 1902], Abh. IV), p. 141.

¹² Read by Pearl.

INV. NO. 9594

β Πάυνι ἐβδόμη
καὶ εἰκάδι¹³

INV. NO. 9619

νβ-
Φαμε(νῶθ) κβ¹⁵

The omission of the name suggests that in some of the receipts the name ought to be found inserted by a second hand. As a matter of fact, this does not occur in the ostraca but can be illustrated from the Fayyum receipts on papyrus,¹⁶ especially those which were so prepared that only the name of the contributor remained to be added at the end.¹⁷

Among the texts published by Amundsen are two which appear to qualify as unfinished certificates of work on the embankments. Unfortunately, they do not stand up under examination. The revised texts may not be misplaced as an appendix to the preceding discussion.

¹³ The space between the numerals is blank. The numeral on the left is, of course, the number of the cleruchy, but the significance of the numeral on the right cannot be inferred with exactitude from the context. It may be a reference to the ninth *kollema* of a daybook compiled by the local overseers of the *corvée*. Such references are illustrated in *P. Mich.*, Inv. No. 4697 A recto, a *corvée* ledger, of which a few lines are reproduced in *TAPA*, LXXI (1940), 635. Another possibility is that the work was to be performed in a numbered section of a canal (*ibid.*, pp. 632 f.). Interesting in this connection is the phrase (πρώτη) ἐκβολή in *O. Mich.*, I, 337, 1, and Preisigke's definition of ἐκβολή in his *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Berlin, 1925-31) with reference to *P. Schow* (= *SB*, I, 5124). No. 337 is discussed at greater length in *TAPA*, LXXIII (1942), 84.

¹⁴ See n. 8.

¹⁵ The writing is heavy and coarse, but careless rather than inexperienced. The upper edge of the ostrakon is adorned with three large irregular circles on the left and three heavy dots on the right. This treatment suggests that the ostrakon was consciously discarded as serving no useful purpose.

¹⁶ See n. 7.

¹⁷ E.g., *P.S.I.*, X, 1110.

O. MICH., I, 325 (REVISED)

ἰς Σαβίνος
Σωκ() δνος.¹⁸

The Greek is extremely concise, and the bearing of the statement is obscured. A certain Sabinus contributed one donkey, but for what purpose is not clear. Normally donkeys were required in connection with the dike *corvée*¹⁹ and transportation.²⁰

O. MICH., I, 328 (REVISED)

κη Παῖσις²¹
Ἡρακλ[²²

The editor has failed to note that 328 is broken immediately below line 2, as well as on the right side. Consequently, we cannot know whether the receipt was left unfinished or was completed with the date written below the name.

II. GRAIN MEASURES

The Askren Collection is composed of ninety-seven ostraca purchased at various times from or through Dr. D. L. Askren. Of some the provenance can be established from internal evidence, and all of these were produced in villages of the Fayyum. Of the others the exact provenance is un-

known, but they also come presumably from the Fayyum.²³ Among the latter the editor has published a short text of the third century A.D. which provokes certain doubts.

O. MICH., I, 80

κ' διὰ Σύρου σάκ(κος) α
πυρ(οῦ) μέ(τρα) δ. κηL

The position of *πυρ(οῦ)* is an embarrassment, since *σάκκος α πυροῦ μέτρα δ* would naturally mean "1 sack = 4 metra of wheat."²⁴ Normally, however, a sack contained 3 artabas, which are the equivalent of 30 metra,²⁵ and not even a rough approximation of the usual standard can be reached with 1 sack and 4 metra. If the conventional equation is to be saved from serious impeachment, either *πυρ(οῦ)* must be taken as misplaced or some such word as *κριθῆς* must be supplied before *σάκ(κος)*.²⁶ While it may be argued that the text requires no emendation because the sack actually contained only 4 metra,²⁷ this common-sense view does not advance the interpretation of *κηL*. Does the combination of numeral and symbol mean "twenty-eighth year" or "28½"?²⁸ The

¹⁸ *σάκκος* ostr.; *Σάκκος* Amundsen. On the distinction of *σ* and *ς* in third-century texts see my remarks in *TAPA*, LXXII (1941), 442, 450. With the nominative *δνος* cf. *O. Mich.*, I, 357 and 358. The problem of word division is the same as in *O. Mich.*, Inv. No. 9562, where *ἀφουσεραπικων* must be *Ἀφούτ Σεραπικ(ωνος) δν(ου)* *ς*. Although *Σάκκος* is a possible derivative of the divine name *Σάκος* (cf. *P. Lund*, III, p. 3, n. 1), no such personal name as *Σάκκος* or *Σάκος* is known. (See the addendum on p. 39.)

¹⁹ Ulrich Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1912), I, 1, 335 f.; Friedrich Oertel, *Die Liturgie: Studien zur ptolemäischen und kaiserlichen Verwaltung Ägyptens* (Leipzig, 1917), p. 70.

²⁰ *P. Columbia*, II, 1 r. 4, Introd., which provides an ample bibliography; *O. Oslo*, p. 48.

²¹ *Παῖσις* Amundsen, whose lead I have followed. *Πα* is very clear, but the ambiguous formation of the following letters produces no single convincing impression. Another possibility is *Παεφς*. The bracket has been inserted in order to show that the break on the right side extends through both lines of the text.

²² *Ἡρακλ[είδου]* Amundsen, but I have not discovered the basis of the restoration.

²³ *O. Mich.*, I, pp. ix, 225 f.

²⁴ As a rule, the designation of the grain precedes the first member of an equation, but that position is not obligatory. See the revised text of *O. Mich.*, I, 442, which is presented at the end of this section, and cf. W. E. Crum and H. I. Bell, *Wadi Sarga: Coptic and Greek Texts* ("Coptica," Vol. III [Copenhagen, 1922]), p. 157.

²⁵ Leiv Amundsen, *O. Oslo*, p. 50; Angelo Segrè, *Metrologia e circolazione monetaria degli antichi* (Bologna, 1928), p. 31. The Oxyrhynchus metrological fragment (*P. Oxy.*, I, 9v [p. 77]. 8) has the statement: *ἔχει ἀράβη μέτρα ι*.

²⁶ Cf., e.g., *O. Mich.*, I, 81. 2-4 (*πυροῦ*) (*ἀράβας*) *ς* *μέτρα* *ῖ*, *κριθῆς* (*ἀράβας*) *β* *μέτρα* *ῖ*. But "since wheat was far the commoner crop it is strange that barley, not it, should be the one to be unnamed; one would expect the more usual produce, if either, to be understood, the less usual to be named" (Crum and Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 156).

²⁷ This is the "obvious" interpretation of the Greek and assumes nothing that is impossible in practice. See the discussion of the revised text.

²⁸ See the editor's note.

latter is not explained by the context, and the twenty-eighth year could be assigned only to the reign of Commodus (A.D. 187-88). As it happens, the style of writing, especially the system of abbreviation, permits no earlier date than the third century.²⁹

These considerations have been made the basis of a fresh examination of the ostrakon, and the new text is free of any grave metrological discrepancy.

O. MICH., I, 80 (REVISED)

κ' δι(ἀ) Σύρου σάκ(ος) α,
 πυρ(οῦ) μέτρ(α) κη (ἡμισυ).

Whatever reservations may be proper with regard to the purpose served by these lines,³⁰ their literal significance is not in doubt. On the twentieth day of an unnamed month³¹ a delivery of 1 sack, i.e., 28½ metra, of wheat was effected through Syrus.³² Although 1 sack = 3 ar-

²⁹ The last letter of Σύρου is placed above the line, and πυρ(οῦ) has an oblique stroke through the tail of ρ. The same is true of μέτρ(α) in the revised text.

³⁰ Amundsen has placed the ostrakon among texts which pertain to the transport of grain from a granary to a canal or river harbor, but he has reserved any closer interpretation for his commentary. In a brief remark, however, attached to this text as well as to *O. Mich.*, I, 81, which bears a strong resemblance to No. 80, Amundsen poses the problem of classification thus: "Delivery, or concerning transport?" Amundsen presumably means that the statement on the ostrakon was written down to mark some step in the delivery of the grain either as rents or as taxes from the threshing floor to the public granary or from the granary to a harbor for transshipment to Alexandria. The types that must be considered in this connection are the memorandum, the waybill, and the receipt (see n. 32).

³¹ The numeral might conceivably designate a regional year, but I have allowed the interpretation to be determined by *O. Mich.*, I, 81, since, apart from the introduction of a place name after the date, No. 81 has essentially the same construction as No. 80. Amundsen doubtless sought to emphasize this similarity when he gave them adjacent numbers.

³² *O. Mich.*, I, 81, which has δι(ἀ) Ἀρίστου ἀγελάρης (nom. for gen., as often on the ostraca), suggests that Syrus also was a donkey driver. If both 80 and 81 are waybills, the mention of none but donkey drivers is understandable. A group of four waybills on ostraca of the first century B.C. from the Fayyum actually names only donkey drivers. These were edited by E. G. Turner, *P. Aberd.*, 75a-d, and subsequently corrected and discussed by O. M. Pearl, "Varia papyro-

tabas = 30 metra was the metrological standard,³³ small divergences occurred in practice and were noted in memoranda and receipts.³⁴ A single example taken from the Karanis ostraca will suffice for illustration. In *O. Mich.*, I, 386, a certain Ammonius is credited with σάκοι³⁵ ἑβ̄, (ἀρτάβαι) λα μ(έτρα) ζ, i.e., "12 sacks = 31 artabas + 7 metra." If the words were being used strictly as metrological terms, this equation would be nonsense; but, in fact, each of the sacks in question actually contained, on an average, 3½ metra less than the usual complement of grain. In the same way, the sack of wheat delivered by Syrus lacked 1½ metra of its normal quota.

An interesting comparison with the metrological problem of *O. Mich.*, I, 80, is afforded by an ostrakon of the early fourth century A.D. from Euhemeria.³⁶ The text begins with a date, continues with a personal name, and concludes, according to the editors, with σίτου σάκ(κ)ου(ς) γ, σίτου (ἀρτάβην) α, i.e., "3 sacks of wheat, 1 artaba of wheat."³⁷

logica," *TAPA*, LXXI (1940), 372-78. Waybills of the late second century A.D. from Sedment have been published by Ulrich Wilcken, *Gr. Ostr.*, 1091-1125, who took them to be office memoranda; they have been successfully reinterpreted by Amundsen in *O. Oslo.*, p. 59. Waybills, or texts that may be such, have been found also on ostraca of the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. from Wadi Sarga and the Fayyum (see Crum and Bell, *op. cit.*, pp. 205-12; cf. also p. 163; W. Hengstenberg, "Die griechisch-koptischen MOTAON Ostraka," *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, LXVI [1931], 51-68, and "Nachtrag," *ibid.*, pp. 122-38; H. C. Youtie and W. H. Worrell, "Elmoulon Ostraca," *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection* [Ann Arbor, 1942], pp. 255-94).

³³ See n. 25.

³⁴ Wilcken, *Gr. Ostr.*, I, p. 754; Crum and Bell, *op. cit.*, pp. 19 f., 156 f.; Hengstenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 62; Youtie and Worrell, *op. cit.*, p. 259; Pearl, *op. cit.*, pp. 380 f.

³⁵ See n. 38.

³⁶ Now Kasr el Banat in the northwest corner of the Fayyum.

³⁷ For σίτος = πυρός see Michael Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten* ("Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte," Vol. VII [1925]), pp. 94 f.

The editors remark that "the one artaba of corn is separate from the three sacks of corn, which were equivalent to 9 artabae or thereabouts." To judge, however, from the printed text, the ostrakon has only *σακουγ*, which is easy to interpret as one-third of a sack, *σάκου γ*,³⁸ and it is surely not simple coincidence that one-third of a sack is the normal equivalent of 1 artaba. Since the text consists of only four short lines, it may conveniently be reprinted here in corrected form.

O. FAY., 41 (REVISED)

Παύνει κς
Ἰβιδος σίτου
σάκου γ,
σίτου (ἀρτάβην) α.

In the same way, when the principles used in revising *O. Mich.*, I, 80, are applied to *O. Mich.*, I, 442, a text emerges which follows more closely the usual formulas. The corrections are sufficiently extensive to justify a new edition; the divergences from the *editio princeps* are given in the footnotes. The receipt is dated in A.D. 291 or 292.³⁹

O. MICH., I, 442 (REVISED)

θη(σαυροῦ) ὀρ(ω)δ(εκτίας)⁴⁰ Καρ(ανίδος)
γεν(ήματος) ζ (έτους) ὄν(όματος) Μάνης⁴¹

³⁸ *σάκος* as a variant of *σάκκος* is well attested (cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* [new ed.], s.v. *σάκος ad fin.*). As a rule, fractions are marked with a horizontal, oblique, or curved stroke above the numeral, and only seldom are fractions found without these means of distinction. The normal practice in papyri is described by Ulrich Wilcken, "Die griechischen Ostraka des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande," *Jahrbücher d. Vereins v. Alterth. im Rh.*, LXXXVI (1888), 239 f. The mathematical writers as well as papyri are considered by Ivor Thomas in his account of the fractions in the "Loeb Classical Library" volume, *Selections Illustrating the History of Greek Mathematics*, I (1939), 45 f. Fractions are used without special marks, e.g., in *BGU*, I, 285, 4 (= *P. Chic. Kar.*, 28; *Berichtigungsliste*, I, 36); *P. Chic. Kar.*, 61, 3; 63, 5; 76, 4; *O. Wilbour*, 53, 4; 62, 4.

³⁹ "Date: June 18, 293 A.D." Amundsen; but see n. 46.

⁴⁰ *ὀριδής(κτίας)* Amundsen; but the disagreement is not significant.

⁴¹ Nom. for gen.; cf. nn. 32 (*ad init.*) and 43. Manes is the contributor to whom the receipt was is-

Μάρωνος δι(ά) κτη(νών) Ἰβιδ(ος)⁴² δι(ά)
Νειλάμμων⁴³

ὄνοι δεκαπέντη,⁴⁴ σάκ(και) ιε,
πυρ(οῦ) ῥνπ(αροῦ) ἀρ(τάβαι) τεσσαράκοντα
ἐπτά,⁴⁵

5 (πυροῦ) ῥ(υπαροῦ) μς. (έτους)
κδ⁴⁶

This receipt was issued to Manes, son of Maron, who defrayed the cost of transport on 15 sacks of wheat. Since 1 sack was allotted to each donkey,⁴⁷ 15 sacks necessitated the use of 15 donkeys. Normally the sacks should have held 45 artabas, but in reality 2 additional artabas were distributed among them. The sacks concerned in *O. Mich.*, I, 80 and 386, were not filled to capacity, whereas in 442 they were made to hold an average of 1½ metra in excess.⁴⁸

III. THE DRACHMA AND ITS PARTS

It is common knowledge that the drachma was equated with 6 or 7 obols and the obol with 8 chalkoi.⁴⁹ In the thou-

sued. He was a man of considerable property at Karanis in the late third and early fourth century. See *O. Mich.*, I, Index IV.

⁴² Iblion is the Fayyum village from which the donkeys—κτηνη δημόσια—were obtained. See Amundsen's remarks in *O. Oslo.*, p. 48.

⁴³ *Νειλάμμων*: nom. for gen.; cf. n. 41. Nilammon is the donkey driver.

⁴⁴ δι(ά) κτη(νών) κτλ.: ὄνη(άτου) Ἰέραξ *Νειλάμμωνος δεκαπέντη* Amundsen. *δεκαπέντη*: read *δεκαπέντε*. The omission of the verb is not unusual in transport receipts. Amundsen (*O. Oslo.*, pp. 53 f.) has compiled a list of verbs used in Karanis transport receipts.

⁴⁵ σάκ(και) κτλ.: σάκ(και) ιε. πυρ(οῦ) δ' ἀρ(τάβαι), σάκ(και) δεκαεπτά Amundsen. The equation produced by Amundsen is 15 sacks + 4 artabas = 17 sacks. This is so close to the standard that it does not betray the error in reading.

⁴⁶ (πυροῦ) κτλ.: (έτους) ἑνάτου Παύνη; κδ Amundsen. The symbol given as (πυροῦ) in my transcript can also be (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι). The numeral after (έτους) is ζ or η, seemingly not θ. The name of the month has almost vanished and is certainly illegible on the photograph. The ostrakon itself is not available (see n. 1).

⁴⁷ See n. 25.

⁴⁸ See n. 34.

⁴⁹ According to the Oxyrhynchus metrological fragment (see n. 25), the χαλκήνη has 6 obols, the δραχμή 7 obols. The χαλκήνη is the bronze drachma; the δραχμή

sands of money statements on papyri and ostraca, obols and chalkoi are regularly expressed with symbols which are now well known.⁵⁰ Only rarely—so rarely as hardly to come to notice—do the parts of the drachma seem to be expressed as fractions.⁵¹ A text in which amounts are ex-

pressed only in fractions therefore administers something of a shock. Such a text is *O. Mich.*, I, 100—an ostrakon of the late third or early fourth century A.D.—and it will save a good deal of explanation to repeat the *editio princeps* at this point.⁵²

the billon, or so-called "silver" drachma. The documents show that the billon tetradrachm—the standard coin of Roman Egypt—was valued at 28 or 29 obols. For a brief survey of Egyptian coinage and its complexities see A. C. Johnson, "Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian," *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, ed. Tenney Frank, II (Baltimore, 1936), 424–42.

⁵⁰ Wilcken, *Gr. Ostr.*, I, pp. 818 f. As Wilcken recalls, the obol signs were first listed and described by Montfaucon, *Palaeographia Graeca* (Paris, 1708), pp. 370 f. The symbol for 3 obols is probably in origin the fraction $\frac{1}{3}$ (Eugène and Victor Revillout, "Seconde lettre sur les monnaies égyptiennes," *Revue égyptologique*, III [1885], 91). It became specialized, however, as one-half of the drachma of 6 obols, hence 3 obols, and was so fixed throughout its history. The other obol signs are simply horizontal strokes indicating units. In the Roman period, when statements are in terms of the billon tetradrachm, the obol sign followed by a numeral is usual.

⁵¹ Allowance must be made for the traditional use of $\frac{1}{2}$ drachma = 3 obols (see n. 50). Only fractions or fractional signs not part of the customary system are in question. The few that have come to my attention are listed here with brief comment:

a) *P. Aberd.*, 61 (corrected by H. A. Sanders, *CP*, XXXVI [1941], 63 f.). Since the papyrus bears a receipt covering a first instalment, Sanders' brilliant reading may be subjected to a slight change of construction: "[dr. Aug] (ustas) et Ptol(emaicas) ducentas quad[r]aginta duas, bessem f(acientes) t(otius) s(ummae), CCXLII." This alternative arrangement eliminates *bessem* as a fraction of a drachma.

b) *P. Bad.*, IV, 103. 4: (δραχμάς) δ γ' = 4½ drachmas, but (τριώβολον) and (τετράβολον), if damaged, could easily be mistaken for (τριών).

c) *P. Princeton*, I, 13, xviii, 13–14; but Professor Johnson informs me that his new reading of these lines has eliminated the fractions.

d) *O. Strassb.*, 191. 4: (δραχμήν) μισ(ον) ἥ(μισον); but the last word could be ἥ(μισοβόλον).

e) *P. Mich. Tebt.*, I, 123r, Col. V. 3, where the symbol should be resolved as $\frac{1}{2}$; *ibid.*, Col. IX. 2, a small piece of papyrus has been lost, so that the reading cannot be checked.

f) *P. Mich. Tebt.*, I, 123v, Col. V. 29: (δραχμαί) ἡ(μισον); but this is an impossible reading of the papyrus, which has probably (δρ.) ξ, possibly (δρ.) δ. Dr. E. M. Husselmann, who also has examined the papyrus, prefers the latter.

g) *P. Princeton*, III, 174, II, 5. Professor Johnson has been kind enough to re-examine the papyrus at my request; the fraction is not on the papyrus, which has (δραχμαί) λδ[.]

pressed only in fractions therefore administers something of a shock. Such a text is *O. Mich.*, I, 100—an ostrakon of the late third or early fourth century A.D.—and it will save a good deal of explanation to repeat the *editio princeps* at this point.⁵²

π' Κατέεις⁵³ (δραχμῆς) [⁵⁴
 Οὐενᾶφρις ποι(μὴν) (δρ.) (ἡμισυ)
 Παῆσις Πτολε(μαίου) (δρ.) (τέταρτον)
 Εὐήμερος (δρ.) (τέταρτον)⁵⁵

The psychological ground of this transcript lies in the paleographic resemblance of (ἡμισυ)⁵⁶ and υ, as well as of (τέταρτον)⁵⁶ and 'β.⁵⁷ On the photograph nothing is plainer than υ at the end of line 2 and 'β at the end of line 3. The text thus loses what little interest it may have had, but it serves a useful purpose in emphasizing the exceptional character of money statements in which fractions of the drachma appear.

O. MICH., I, 100 (REVISED)

δι(ᾶ)⁵⁸ Κατέει (δραχμαί) 'β
 Οὐενᾶφρις Γα.()⁵⁹ (δρ.) υ

⁵² Amundsen's text is here kept intact, except that symbols have been resolved so far as possible. An exception is made in l. 4, as indicated in n. 55.

⁵³ Amundsen's note: "π(αρά) Κατέει?"

⁵⁴ Although Amundsen has placed this ostrakon with money accounts, his editorial note on the symbol leaves the interpretation open. This inconsistency has probably resulted from doubt regarding the fractions.

⁵⁵ After (τέταρτον) Amundsen has a zigzag line, such as is often seen for καί. I have omitted it for typographical reasons.

⁵⁶ For the form see Amundsen's edition.

⁵⁷ I.e., 2,000. The form has been reproduced by Wessely in *Stud. Pal.*, XX, 81, Col. I *passim*.

⁵⁸ The ink has faded badly, and both readings—Amundsen's and mine—are doubtful; the meaning, however, is entirely clear. The space seems hardly sufficient to accommodate a personal name. Κατέει without a patronymic occurs also in *O. Mich.*, I, 350. 1. The omission of a father's name is paralleled in l. 4 (cf. n. 60).

⁵⁹ Possibly Γα(). Amundsen was misled by *O. Mich.*, I, 611. 2, where ποιμήν (= ποιμήν) is correct. It should be noted, however, that Οὐενᾶφρις in 611. 2 is a misreading of Οὐανᾶφρις (= Οὐενᾶφρις).

Παῖσις Πτολε(μαίου)
Εὐήμερος⁶⁰

(δρ.) 'β
(δρ.) 'βξ⁶¹

In *O. Mich.*, I, 105, which is a list of money payments contemporary with No. 100, most of the amounts are multiples of 120 drachmas,⁶² but in lines 13 and 14 the drachma signs are suddenly omitted, and the payments are relatively small: (13) ι—, presumably 10 drachmas, 1 obol, and (14) ιαγ, 11½ drachmas. As a matter of fact, these readings have no justification. In each instance, the best interpretation of the faded writing is (δραχμαί) σμ. Furthermore, line 15 presents a problem of another kind. The total, γ(ινονται) (τάλαντα) ρξ, is out of all proportion to the preceding amounts. This difficulty was recognized by Tait, whose suggestion is recorded in the editorial note: "For (τάλαντα) perhaps rather (τάλαντον)." A faithful reading of the line, so far as I can judge from the photograph, is (δραχμαί) 'ερξ, i.e., 5,160 drachmas.⁶³ If allowance is made for the losses at the top and the bottom of the ostrakon, this sum is not excessive, and it has the advantage of being a multiple of 120.

O. Mich., I, 101, which is contemporary with Nos. 100 and 105, is also regarded by the editor as a money account, but it has certain puzzling features. As far as line 10 no mention is made either of drachmas or of obols, and the amounts are small,

⁶⁰ In *O. Mich.*, I (see Index IV), this name occurs always without a patronymic; the person is doubtless the same throughout. Perhaps he was an ἀράτωρ.

⁶¹ ξ corresponds to Amundsen's zigzag line (see n. 55); but the photograph is not helpful, and any reading would be doubtful.

⁶² The text is fragmentary, and certain portions cannot be checked on the photograph. The editor, who inspected the ostrakon itself, remarks that the "writing is very faint and faded; in the upper left corner the surface is blackened."

⁶³ This reading is supported also by the editor's drawing of the writing as it looked to him on the ostrakon.

usually 1½, a single occurrence of 2, and another of 3. In lines 11 and 12, however, drachmas are specified, and the amounts are comparatively large:

11 'H]ρᾱς 'Ατισίου (δραχμαί) ο
12] (δραχμαί) ο—

Unfortunately, line 12 has been misread, and line 11 is amenable to another interpretation.

REVISED TEXT

11 'H]ρᾱς 'Ατισίου καὶ⁶⁴ ὁ
12 [ἀδελ]φ(ὸς)⁶⁵ β—⁶⁶

With these corrections the entire text acquires a uniform character. The persons whose names are listed contributed 1½, 2, or 3 units of an object not specified, but the nature of the contribution is readily deduced from comparison with the "lists of donkey drivers and caravans," as Amundsen aptly terms them.⁶⁷ In them the persons named are credited with ½–3 donkeys.⁶⁸ No. 101 closely resembles these lists.

⁶⁴ The same double curve that is used for δραχμή, ἔρος, and ἡμισ, is also not infrequently a writing of καί (see E. M. Thompson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* [Oxford, 1912], p. 81). The evolution of cursive καί is illustrated in a table provided by Paul Viereck, "Die Ostraka des Berliner Museums," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, I (1901), p. 450. In l. 5 of our ostrakon the same formula is employed, and καί is written in full.

⁶⁵ There remains only the tiny angle which forms the top of φ when it is written as in l. 5. For examples of this type see Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 192, Col. 3, examples 5 and 8; p. 193, Col. 1, example 9.

⁶⁶ Only the upper half of the letter is preserved, but that corresponds almost exactly to the distinctive shape of β in l. 10.

⁶⁷ *O. Mich.*, I, 330–55.

⁶⁸ The metrological significance of fractional parts of a "donkey" is explained by Amundsen (*O. Oslo*, p. 50). In *O. Oslo*, 26 (fourth or fifth century A.D.), 12 drivers are in charge of 40 donkeys, with roughly 3 animals to a driver. In one instance a driver had only 2 under his care, and in another he was responsible for 6. The use of fractions in connection with donkey caravans may arise either when 1 or more donkeys are not fully loaded or when the supervision of an odd number of donkeys is shared by 2 drivers. In the Oslo ostrakon, e.g., 7 donkeys have 2 drivers.

No other ostraca in the Michigan collection exhibit fractional parts of the drachma, and their elimination from Nos. 100, 101, and 105 means that no support can be found in *O. Mich.*, I, or elsewhere for this unconventional practice.⁶⁹

IV. MORE ABOUT FRACTIONS

In a brief section entitled "Lists of Land"⁷⁰ the editor of the Michigan ostraca from Karanis has included a text of the late third or early fourth century A.D., of which the meaning is not immediately evident. In assigning the ostrakon to this category he has imposed on the text a more complex interpretation than memoranda on ostraca usually bear. For the reader's convenience the few lines are repeated here, and the fractions which they contain are expanded.

O. MICH., I, 265

κρέως σὺν
τῇ α ἀρούρη] [α (ἐνενηκοστόν)]
α (ἥμισυ) (ἐνενηκοστότεταρτον)⁷¹
χοιριδ(ious) (ἥμισυ) (τέταρτον) (τεσσαρα-
κοστόγδοον)
5 βοιδ(ious) (ἥμισυ) (τέταρτον) (τεσσαρα-
κοστόγδοον)

If I have correctly grasped the force of Amundsen's classification, the Greek may be construed in this way: <There have been devoted to pasturage for the production> of meat, including the 1 aroura, $1\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{4}$ <arouras,⁷² of which> $\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{8}$ <aroura

is set aside> for swine, $\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{8}$ <aroura> for cattle.

The use of $\frac{1}{8}$ in connection with arouras is strange. The only series of fractions regularly used elsewhere with this standard land-measure is $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{16}$, $\frac{1}{32}$, $\frac{1}{64}$, etc.⁷³ The fractions $\frac{1}{4}$ ⁷⁴ and $\frac{1}{8}$ are perhaps not impossible as divisions of the aroura, since $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{32}$ have been found in isolated instances with the aroura, but the occurrence of $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{8}$ aroura in this ostrakon would be unique.⁷⁵ Furthermore, quantities recorded in a list headed κρέως are naturally expected to pertain to meat. I know of no other text, whether literary or documentary, in which the word is so pregnant with unexpected significance as in Amundsen's transcript of the Michigan ostrakon. These considerations have led to certain points of view which have served as guides in the revision of the ostrakon; and, inasmuch as the ends of the lines have been by no means easy to read, it may be well to submit these critical reflections to the reader by way of establishing the psychological basis of the new text: (1) the fractions point away from a land list; (2) κρέως points to a meat list; (3) τῇ α looks as if it ought to be the date of the memorandum; (4) χοιριδ() and βοιδ() are likely introductions to quantities of pork and beef.

This approach has succeeded in eliminating the chief difficulties created by the *editio princeps*. The revised text is a meat list, but it is concerned, as we shall see, with public business.

⁶⁹ See n. 51. The drachma-weight is described as *μονὰς ἀρπαγῆς* by Philo *De congressu* 113. "A unit without fractions" is Colson's expert translation (Philo, IV, 514 f. ["Loeb Classical Library"]).

⁷⁰ *O. Mich.*, I, pp. 75 f.

⁷¹ The fraction as printed by Amundsen may be $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$. My preference for $\frac{1}{2}$ is explained in n. 72.

⁷² $\frac{1}{4}$ would be an error for $\frac{1}{2}$. Thus l. 3 may be taken as a total, which is analyzed in ll. 4 and 5. This arrangement of an account, with a total followed by an analytical statement, is abundantly illustrated in

papyri. See, e.g., my remarks on α1 *προκείμενα* in CP, XXXIII (1938), 427, and TAPA, LXIX (1938), 96; on *ῶν*, *ibid.*, pp. 92 f., 102 f.; on certain statements of catœcic dues, *ibid.*, pp. 86 f.

⁷³ Wilcken, *op. cit.* (see n. 19), pp. lxix, lxxii.

⁷⁴ See n. 72.

⁷⁵ The irregular fractions have been discussed in some detail by Wilcken, *Gr. Ostr.*, I, pp. 776-79.

V. THE CONTOUR OF AN OSTRACON

In order to illustrate one of the less obvious pitfalls which impede the progress of even the most conscientious reader of ostraca, I have chosen to reproduce a simple transport receipt⁸⁷ of the fourth century A.D.

O. MICH., I, 553

Φαρμο(ῖθι) αἰκτ[η]⁸⁸
 Ἀντών(ως) Ἀππ[ιανού(?) διὰ
 Ἀτρῆ⁸⁹ ὄν(ους) δύο [.
 σέση(μείωμαι).

The substance of this text is meager and hardly important: a certain Antony, son of Appian, acting through Hatres, has contributed 2 donkeys. Nevertheless, when the ostrakon is subjected to a careful scrutiny, four significant features emerge:

(1) The brackets coincide with the present right edge of the ostrakon. (2) The text assumes that approximately a third of the writing surface of the ostrakon is lost on the right side. (3) In spite of this loss, the fourth line is complete, the first line requires only a single additional letter, and the third line would be complete if the illegible trace indicated as close to the right edge of the ostrakon proved to be an illusion. (4) Consequently, the second line with its relatively lengthy supplement is the basis of the editor's assumption that the ostrakon has not been preserved intact.

A revision of the text undertaken by Dr. Pearl revealed that the second line had been misread. The ostrakon has Πτολεμαῖος, which extends to the right edge. Guided thereafter by the suspicion that the ostrakon was not damaged, Dr. Pearl arrived at a still simpler text.

⁸⁷ See n. 92.

⁸⁸ Read αἰκτῆ (Amundsen).

O. MICH., I, 553 (REVISED)

Φαρμο(ῖθι) αἰκτῆ
 Πτολεμαῖος
 Ἀτρῆ⁸⁹ ὄν(ους) δύο.
 σέση(μείωμαι).⁹⁰

In this form the text follows the same pattern as O. Mich. I, 556 and 557, except that these do not have σέσημείωμαι. It is a receipt reduced to a bare outline: date, name, contribution.⁹¹ It has the concise and cryptic character of a memorandum; even the purpose of the contribution is not revealed.⁹² Another specimen of this class has been found among the unpublished ostraca of the Michigan collection. Written in the late third or early fourth century A.D., it resembles Nos. 556 and 557 in lacking σέσημείωμαι.

O. MICH. INV. NO. 9562

Ἐπείφ ξ
 Ἀφούς Σεραπί(ωνος) ὄν(ους) ε.⁹³

From this and similar experiences has issued a methodological principle.⁹⁴ An os-

⁸⁹ Ptolemy, son of Hatres, does not otherwise appear in the Michigan ostraca.

⁹⁰ This may be called the controller's statement; sometimes it is written by a second hand. On the omission of the official's name see my brief remarks in *TAPA*, LXXI (1940), 626, n. 21. The relation of tax receipts to tax-collectors' records, as there described, is supported by a parallel drawn from another branch of administrative activity in Paul M. Meyer, "Die Libelli aus der decianischen Christenverfolgung," *Abh. Akad. Wiss. Berl., Phil.-hist. Cl.*, 1910, Anhang, Abh. V, p. 23. (For this reference I am indebted to Dr. E. R. Smothers, S.J.)

⁹¹ See my remarks on a number of *corvée* receipts (O. Mich. I, 319, 326, and Inv. Nos. 9795, 9984, discussed in *TAPA*, LXXII [1941], 442, 445-47) and a group of money receipts on ostraca (*ibid.*, LXXI [1940], 645, esp. n. 73).

⁹² The texts have been classified by the editor as receipts covering the expenses of transport from a granary to a canal or river port. In the absence of a specific indication, Dr. Pearl suggests that this classification is too narrow, since donkeys were also requisitioned for work in connection with the *corvée* (see n. 19).

⁹³ See n. 18.

⁹⁴ The principle was elaborated by me in the course of revising O. Mich., I, 492 (*TAPA*, LXXII [1941], 448 f.) and 539 (*AJP*, LXIII [1942], 72 f.), but it was not made the subject of a formal statement. Its application to O. Mich., I, 553, is entirely the work of Dr. Pearl, who has placed his notes at my disposal.

tracoon may appear to be broken on the right or on the left, or on both sides, but if one or more lines begin or end with a complete word, it is advisable to experiment with the notion that the ostracoon retains its original dimensions.⁹⁵ The proportion of ostraca in the Michigan collection which have suffered serious damage involving a considerable reduction in size is not large.⁹⁶

There is another less frequent but more subtle risk to which the reader of ostraca is exposed. The writing is so often faded, sometimes almost to the point of invisibility, and the surface is so often abraded that an editor may be forgiven if he occasionally posits a lacuna where no writing was ever done. By way of illustration I submit a text of the third century A.D.

O. MICH., I, 13

(ἐτους) α'' δι(ἐγραψε)
 κωμάρχαις
 κώμης Φιλ[α]δελ[φίας]
 Λογ'χ[ά]ρι[ος] (δραχμας) ἑκατὸν ὀκτώ,
 5 γ(ίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) ρη.

According to this receipt, a certain Loncharius⁹⁷ has paid 108 drachmas to the

⁹⁵ B. D. Meritt (*Epigraphica Attica* [Cambridge, Mass., 1940], pp. 9-13) has emphasized from another point of view the necessity of observing with care the edges of a stone bearing an inscription. Although he is not explicit on this point, his discussion rests ultimately on the same method of establishing the presumption of a margin.

⁹⁶ Naturally every ostracoon must be examined on its own merits, and a decision may not always be possible. For example, in *O. Mich.*, I, 188, ll. 1, 2, and 4 might be complete on the right side, but l. 3 and probably l. 5 have suffered some loss. This last might be taken as complete, but the omission of month and day in the Michigan chaff receipts (I, 52, 53, 177-233) is restricted to a single example (194). This count, of course, excludes all those not sufficiently preserved to provide opportunity for judgment. At the end of l. 3 the editor has ventured $\xi\lambda\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma$, but κ is an impossible reading. The most satisfactory interpretation is $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\chi\epsilon\rho\upsilon$, which might have been abbreviated $\acute{\alpha}\chi(\epsilon\rho\upsilon)$, as in *O. Theb.*, 110. Consequently, l. 3 may lack only one letter and the other lines may be intact, but the absence of month and day in l. 5 leaves that conclusion dubious at best.

⁹⁷ The name has not occurred on papyri or ostraca (cf. Friedrich Preisigke, *Namenbuch* [Heidelberg,

comarchs of Philadelphia, an important village of the Fayyum,⁹⁸ for an unspecified purpose, but doubtless to discharge a tax obligation.⁹⁹ Unfortunately, the editor has been misled in his reading of lines 4 and 5. The scribe, having begun at the level of line 4, curved down to the level of line 5 in an attempt to avoid a roughness on the surface of the ostracoon. In doing so he was following a common and sensible practice. Fairly often a writer using papyrus or an ostracoon will skip a space or two because the surface is too rough to take the pen, but he then continues on the same level.¹⁰⁰ Here, however, the scribe was distracted by the lower edge of the ostracoon, which begins just below the first letter of line 4 and runs obliquely downward to meet the right edge. The vertical distance between the two lower corners of the ostracoon is 2.7 cm., while the width of the ostracoon is 6.4 cm. The grade, therefore, is gradual, and when the scribe found himself following the lower edge, he tilted the ostracoon slightly to bring the edge into position and wrote the last line parallel with it. In consequence, there is only a line 4 and no line 5. The revised text contributes also other minor improvements.

1922], and the indexes of the same author's *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten* [Strassburg, 1913-] and *Berichtigungsliste d. griech. Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten*, II [Heidelberg, 1931-33]). Wilhelm Pape (*Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* [3d ed.; Braunschweig, 1911]) lists $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\chi\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$ and $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\chi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$, but not $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$.

⁹⁸ It is now the western termination of the Darb el Gerza, a road which links the Nile Valley with the Fayyum.

⁹⁹ The renewed prestige of the comarchs and their responsibility with respect to tax collection in the third century appear to be consequences of the great movement of reform initiated by Severus' establishment of the senate in the nome capitals and confirmed by Caracalla's universal grant of citizenship (see Pierre Jouguet, *La Vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine* [Paris, 1911], p. 397; Oertel, *op. cit.* [see n. 19], p. 154).

¹⁰⁰ One example out of many is *O. Mich.*, I, 385, 2, where $\Lambda\omicron\sigma\omega\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is a misreading of $\Lambda\omicron\sigma\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$. The surface of the ostracoon is decidedly irregular, and the scribe left a space between σ and κ .

O. MICH., I, 13 (REVISED)

(ἔτους) α' δι(ἐγραψας)¹⁰¹

κωμάρχαις

κώμης Φιλ[α]δε[λ]φίας¹⁰²Μεχίρ (δραχμάς) ρπ.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ The 2d pers. sing. appears to be justified by the omission of the name of the contributor. The receipt, however, thus lacks an essential element, and the omission is perhaps to be explained with the same set of ideas that has been brought to bear on the problem of the controller's statement (cf. n. 90). At the same time, the 2d pers. is unusual in receipts and is expected only after a prescript, as, e.g., in *P. Oslo.*, III, 118; *P. Princeton*, III, 131, 133; *O. Mey.*, 15, 16, 19; *O. Strassb.*, 171. Other interpretations are possible. If δι(ἐγράψαν) were correct, the ostrakon might be a statement issued to the comarchs by the state bank. Even δι(ἐγραψε) is not excluded, since the omission of a personal name could be explained on the assumption that the receipt is the continuation of a text recorded on another ostrakon. This manner of utilizing ostraca in a series has been discussed in *TAPA*, LXXIII (1942), 67 f.

¹⁰² Amundsen's text shows that he felt entirely secure in his reading of the village name. I have retained his reading with dots throughout, because neither the ostrakon nor the photograph (see n. 1) enables me to accept it without reserve.

¹⁰³ The editor put ργ into his text but allowed in his notes for ρπ. The letters η, ν, and π have a certain resemblance in hands of the third and fourth centuries.

The text is no longer a receipt issued by the comarchs to Loncharius for the payment of 108 drachmas, but a receipt for 180 drachmas issued by them to a person whose name is not given.¹⁰⁴ To be sure, the receipt has no discernible importance, but it does emphasize the significant role of the comarchs in the collection of taxes.¹⁰⁵

ADDENDUM

In reconsidering *O. Mich.*, I, 325, I find no objection to Σώκων except that it is unattested elsewhere. As I have pointed out, it could be a theophoric name, and we are still far from having an exhaustive list of Egyptian names. If Σώκοπος does, in fact, represent the intention of the scribe, then No. 325 is also an unfinished certificate of work on the embankments.

¹⁰⁴ This statement needs the qualifications provided in n. 101.

¹⁰⁵ See n. 99. A few other Michigan ostraca also illustrate the varied activity of the comarchs: I, 25 (collection of barley), 234 (collection of hay), 339 and 340 (mobilization of donkeys).

INDEXES

I. OSTRACA AND PAPYRI
IN THE MICHIGAN
COLLECTION

	PAGE
O. I, 13	38
80	30
81	31
100	33
101	34
105	34
188	38
265	35
303	28
304	28
306	28
307	28
310	28
313	28

	PAGE
316	28
318	28
320	28
325	30, 39
328	30
385	38
386	31
442	32
553	37
611	33
O. Inv. 9332	28
9500	28
9514	29
9546	29
9562	37
9594	29
9609	28

	PAGE
9619	29
9639	29
9656	29
9790	28
9983	28
10252	28
P. II, 123	33

II. OTHER OSTRACA
AND PAPYRI

O. Fay., 41	32
O. Strassb., 191	33
P. Aberd., 61	33
P. Bad., IV, 103	33
P. Princeton, I, 13, xviii	33
— III, 174, ii	33

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

P. OXYRHYNCHUS 668.188-90

q. occius
 q̄s.nsiidiisus[[s]]itanorumfortissime
 inae' devotaest aquaannioaqua¹
 tolium contrasibyllaecarmina

The lines above are the transcription of lines 187-90, and the end of line 186, of the Oxyrhynchus Epitome of Livy as it appears in O. Rossbach's Teubner edition.²

The sense of both sentences is, in a general way, quite clear. But the crucial line, 188, has been variously restored. Grenfell and Hunt restore it to read *pugnavit*, to complete the first sentence, indicate space for three letters, and suggest emending *devota* to *renovata* or *refecta*.³ E. Kornemann⁴ prints Gundermann's restoration: "[pugnavit. Iovi] in aede(m) vota est aqua Anio." Luterbacher⁵ restores the line: "[pugnans cecidit.] in aede(m) Vestae aqua Anio." Rossbach⁶ prints: "[pugnavit . . .] in aede vota est aqua Anio." He suggests in his apparatus: "in urbe reaedificata est." Ashby⁷ restores the passage by transferring *aqua Anio* from *devota est* to the restored verb of which *aqua* [Marcia] is the subject and reads: "Aqua Anio, aqua [Marcia] ... [perductae]." All these restorations labor under several handicaps. They are either too short or too long to satisfy the space requirements. They radically alter the division of words as they appear in the papyrus. And they find no confirmation in Frontinus's⁸ account of the quarrel

¹ Rossbach (*T. Livi Periochae omnium librorum* [Teubner, 1910], p. 142, l. 188) inadvertently printed *annioqua*, but his photographic facsimile shows that the papyrus reads *annioaqua*.

² *Ibid.*

³ *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, IV, No. 668, pp. 101, 113.

⁴ *Klio*, Beiheft II, 31.

⁵ According to Rossbach's apparatus (*op. cit.*, p. 143).

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Aqueducts of Ancient Rome*, p. 88, n. 4; and Platner-Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary*, p. 26, n. 1.

⁸ *De aquis* I. 7.

that arose over extending the Aqua Marcia to the Capitoline.

Grenfell and Hunt⁹ inadvertently omitted *non esse* in transcribing their quotation of Frontinus' words on the subject and overlooked the fact that Frontinus cites Fenestella as his source, thus invalidating their conclusion that the Epitome's account and that of Frontinus are in complete accord and that Frontinus took Livy as his source.

Ashby's restoration suffers from two fatal defects. . . . *inae devota est* must be construed as a third, or rather the second of three, sentences, though there can be at most no more than five spaces in which to supply a subject for *devota est*. And the assumption that the Anio was also extended to the Capitoline is incorrect. Frontinus' statement¹⁰ that the Anio Vetus could have served the higher points of the city if it had been raised on substructures and arches at the proper places shows that as late as Trajan's time the Anio had not been brought to the Capitoline.

The restorations of Gundermann and Kornemann, Luterbacher, and Rossbach, which redistribute . . . *inae devota est* to read *in aede* or *aedem Vestae* or *vota est* or *in urbe reaedificata est*, are plays on letters without support from the sources.

The first step in restoring line 188 must be the attempt to find the proper conclusion of the sentence that begins at the end of line 186. Its subject, Q. Occius, made such a reputation as a fighter while serving as legate of Q. Metellus Macedonicus in Spain that he received the cognomen Achilles.¹¹ Valerius Maximus omits other exploits of his to recount the two famous

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 113.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.* I. 18. Grenfell and Hunt (*op. cit.*, p. 113) anticipated Ashby's restoration and rejected it on the same grounds as the present writer, without, however, invoking Frontinus' conclusive statement (I.18) concerning the level of the Anio in his day.

¹¹ Valerius Maximus iii. 2. 21.

single combats which Occius fought in 142 B.C. The second of these fights, against a distinguished Celtiberian chieftain, Tyresius or Pyrrhus, is also reported by the Oxyrhynchus Epitome (ll. 164-66) substantially as told by Valerius Maximus. The activities of Occius after 142 B.C. are unrecorded except for the statement of the Oxyrhynchus epitomator (ll. 186-88) that he fell into an ambush laid by the Lusitanians in 140 B.C.¹² The damaged condition of the papyrus at the conclusion of this sentence leaves the fate of Occius uncertain.

The brilliant exploits which Occius achieved in an otherwise inglorious chapter of Roman military history made him a public figure of heroic proportions. It seems unlikely, therefore, that his mere escape from ambush by brave fighting would have been recorded as particularly noteworthy by an epitomator whose profession limited him to recording extraordinary or important events. For this reason the writer would reject *pugnavit*, the restoration of Grenfell and Hunt, Kornemann, and Rossbach.

The brave death of a public hero, overcome by the treachery of his enemies in an unfair fight, would, however, be precisely the sort of item to appeal to the taste of the Oxyrhynchus epitomator.¹³ This is the conclusion reached by Luterbacher, in his restoration *pugnans cecidit*, and by Münzer,¹⁴ who points out the close parallel that exists between the careers of Q. Occius and L. Sicius Dentatus,¹⁵ a plebeian hero of the fifth century B.C., who died in a treacherous ambush set by the decemvirs.¹⁶

Luterbacher's restoration contains, however, fourteen letters, though there is space for not more than twelve.¹⁷ This difficulty, however, can be easily removed by deleting *pugnans*. Livy frequently uses *cadere* without participial modifiers in the sense of "to die" or "to

be killed."¹⁸ Cicero even employs the phrase *cadere fortiter*.¹⁹ There is, thus, excellent authority for restoring *cecidit* in the first seven spaces of line 188 and connecting *fortissime* directly with it.²⁰ Lines 186-88 would then read:

Q. Occius
oppressus [i]nsidiis Lus[an]itanorum fortissime
cecidit. . . .]

Any restoration of the remaining five spaces of line 188 must square with the account Frontinus gives²¹ of the quarrels that attended the building of the Aqua Marcia. The acceptance of this statement entails the rejection of all the restorations listed above.

According to Frontinus, the senate authorized the urban praetor, Q. Marcius Rex, in 144 B.C. to repair the Aqua Appia and the Aqua Anio (Vetus) and to reclaim them from illicit users of their waters. It also instructed him to secure an additional supply of water to meet the city's growing needs. His term of office was not sufficient for the task, and so his imperium was unprecedentedly renewed for another year.²² In 143 B.C. the decemvirs discovered, while examining the Sibylline books for other reasons, that the sacred oracles forbade the extension of the Aqua Marcia—there was another tradition, Frontinus says, that it was the Aqua Anio—to the Capitoline. The dispute reached the floor of the senate, where the leader of the opposition to the decemviral faction was M. Lepidus.²³ He and Q. Marcius Rex succeeded

¹² See examples in *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, s.v. "cado," I B 1, p. 23.

¹³ *Ad familiares* xiv. 3. 1.

¹⁴ Rossbach (*op. cit.*, p. 142) writes: "188 tertio et quarto loco vestigia litterarum *g* et *n* videntur superesse." There is, however, no trace of them in the photograph. The recto on which the Epitome is written is, moreover, torn away at this point, leaving only the back surface of the verso. In any case, the photograph shows that the upper part of *c* and *g* are the same. And *i* could look like the upper part of either perpendicular bar of *n*.

¹⁵ I. 7. The writer has discussed this passage in a forthcoming study on the history of the building of the Aqua Marcia, "The Denarius of M' Aemilius Lepidus and the Aqua Marcia" (to appear in the *AJ A*).

¹⁶ For the unusual character of this prorogation of imperium to be exercised within the pomerium see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*³, I, 637, n. 1.

¹⁷ See Münzer's analysis of the political background of the whole episode in *Römische Adelsgeschichte*, pp. 238-45. He summarizes his conclusion in *RE*, XIV, 1582. 90.

¹² See Münzer, *RE*, XVII, 1763, for an account of the career of Q. Occius.

¹³ See Grenfell and Hunt, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*

¹⁵ Münzer, *RE*, II A, 2189-90.

¹⁶ Livy iii. 43. 2-7; Dionysius *Antiq.* xi. 25-27. 7.

¹⁷ Rossbach (*op. cit.*, p. 142) writes: "188-190 ineuntibus desunt non plures quam 12 litterae"; and cf. his photographic facsimile of this portion of the papyrus.

in defeating the obstructive moves of the decemvirs in 143 B.C. and again in 140 B.C., when the Cornelian faction sought once more to block the Marcia's extension.

Two points in this account are important to the restoration of line 188 of the Epitome: mention of the Aqua Anio and the identity of M. Lepidus.

Since Frontinus leaves no doubt that the Anio was not extended to the Capitoline, the question arises of how the confusion in his sources concerning the Anio and the Marcia ever developed. It is clear from Frontinus' statement²⁴ that the chief task assigned to Marcus Rex by the senate was the restoration of the old aqueducts. Because of the increasing needs of the city he was further commissioned to augment the water supply from any other sources he could obtain. The senate obviously considered it perfectly possible for Marcus to finish his task in one year, since his authority derived from his imperium as urban praetor. This means that they did not expect him to build a new aqueduct, which would have required several years and was a task that fell within the province of the censors.²⁵ In bidding

him seek other sources of supply, the senate must, therefore, have expected Marcus to increase the volume of the Anio by supplying it with new springs. Since the Anio was capable of serving the higher quarters of the city, the senate may well have specified in its decree that the Anio be extended to the Capitoline.²⁶ Marcus, however, chose to meet the senate's desire for an enlarged water supply by building a new aqueduct rather than by enlarging and extending the capacity of the Anio. A year later political opponents tried to deprive Marcus of the prestige of bringing water to the Capitoline by appealing to the Sibylline books.²⁷ M. Lepidus, a political ally of Marcus Rex, furnished the skill as a speaker and parliamentarian needed to parry this oblique attack in 143 B.C.²⁸

The question now arises as to the identity of M. Lepidus. Münzer has convincingly shown²⁹ that the M. Lepidus mentioned by Frontinus was M. Aemilius Lepidus Porcina, the consul of 137 B.C., who is warmly praised by Cicero as a speaker.³⁰ Münzer and Colin³¹ have shown further that Porcina was praetor at Rome in 143 B.C. M. Aemilius Lepidus Porcina, as I have tried to show elsewhere,³² was moved in his championship of the Aqua Marcia not merely by political considerations but by strong family loyalty as well, since the Aqua Marcia was in reality the completion of the aqueduct begun by his grandfather, or father, M. Aemilius Lepidus, and M. Fulvius Nobilior, the censors of 179 B.C.³³ Since Aemilius Porcina had so

²⁴ I. 7: "... cum Appiae Anionisque ductus vastitate quassati privatorum etiam fraudibus interpererentur, datum est a senatu negotium Marcio, qui tum praetor inter cives ius dicebat, eorum ductuum reficiendorum ac vindicandorum. Et quoniam incrementum urbis exigere videbatur ampliorem modum aquae, eidem mandatum a senatu est, ut curaret, quatenus alias aquas quas posset in urbem perduceret."

²⁵ See Ashby, *op. cit.*, pp. 41, 191-92; Frontinus *op. cit.* I. 5, 6, 7, 8, 13-14; and Stuart, *op. cit.* for the time required to build several of Rome's aqueducts. Another clue to the senate's plans is the amount it appropriated for the task. The text of the sum is, unfortunately, textually uncertain (see F. Krohn [Teubner ed., 1922]). Schulze emended the manuscript, reading, *mine octingente .S7, to milies octingentes*. It represented, according to Frontinus, the total sum appropriated for the cost of the restoration of the older aqueducts and the construction of the new one. There is no way of knowing whether the sum represents a single appropriation or several. Since the senate was obliged to extend the term of Marcus' authority, it is more probable that there were at least two separate appropriations. Marcus' ambitious plans for the new aqueduct undoubtedly required more money than he was voted in 144 B.C. A curious, incompletely preserved inscription seems to indicate that Marcus also drew heavily upon his own resources to finance his building activities (*CIL*, I, 2172 = V, 2866: "Sei qui minus rem reliquit, | liberet sibi quærant. | Tu viator vale. Ad aquas | sunt spissa | Q. Marcus

P. f. Ser. Rex") and suggests that the quarreling in 143 and 140 B.C. may have been in part concerned with the financial side of Marcus' operations.

²⁶ This is the view of Kornemann (*op. cit.*, p. 63), which seems to me to be correct. The same view is implied in Münzer's interpretation of Frontinus' account (*RE*, XIV, 1582. 90).

²⁷ For the bitter partisan aspect of the maneuvers in 143 B.C. see Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien*, pp. 238-45.

²⁸ For the relations of Aemilius Porcina and Marcus Rex see *ibid.*

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Brutus* 95-96.

³¹ *Römische Adelsparteien*, pp. 239-40; G. Colin, *Rome et la Grèce* ("Bibliothèque d. l'écoles franç. d'Athènes et de Rome," Vol. XCIV), p. 509, n. 2.

³² Stuart, *op. cit.*

³³ Livy xl. 51. 7.

successfully defeated the efforts of his political opponents in 143 B.C. to block the extension of the Marcia, who was better fitted than he to thwart the second attempt in 140 B.C., which Frontinus says took place and which the Epitome clearly implies?

The opponents of Porcina and Marcius Rex would have been unusual politicians if they had failed to represent the substitution of the Aqua Marcia for the Aqua Anio in spite of the Sibylline prohibition as anything but a self-seeking, irreligious bid for personal glory and prestige on the part of Porcina and Marcius Rex.³⁴ The Anio, they argued, was selected originally. The sacred books forbade the Marcia's extension. To insist on carrying the Marcia to the Capitoline was to be guilty of *nefas*. This argument failed to convince a majority of the senate both in 143 and in 140 B.C. But annalists hostile to the Aemilio-Marcian faction, whether they favored their chief opponents, the Cornelian party,³⁵ or not, undoubtedly continued to stress the ungodliness of Porcina and Marcius in flouting the Sibylline books. Their activities and the probable designation of the Anio in the senate's original decree of authorization in 144 B.C. ultimately created the confusion that Frontinus found in his sources concerning the identity of the aqueduct debarred from the Capitoline by the Sibylline books.

Even in its mutilated condition it is clear from the strong antithesis between "... inae devota est aqua Anio" and "aqua [Marcia in Cap]itolium contra Sibyllae carmina [perducta]" that Livy used sources which took this view of the quarrel. The Aqua Anio was consigned like a sacrificial victim to destruction at the hands of ... inae as though to a destroying spirit of the underworld, while the Aqua Marcia was brought triumphantly to the Capitoline contrary to the admonition of the Sibyl! The violence of the metaphor is the measure of the bitterness that this incident aroused.

Cicero, in speaking of the hated Clodius,

³⁴ The maneuvers of Appius Claudius to secure sole credit for building the Aqua Appia illustrate the otherwise well-documented desire of the Romans to associate their names with public works (Frontinus *op. cit.* I. 5; Livy ix. 29. 6, 33-34; Cicero *Pro Caelio* 34; Eutropius ii. 9).

³⁵ For the hostility at this time of these groups see Münzer, *Römische Adelsparteien*, pp. 239-40.

uses the same image: "accedit etiam quod expectatione omnium fortissimo et clarissimo viro, T. Annio, devota et constituta ista hostia esse videtur."³⁶ Cicero, it is true, supplies *hostia* to clarify the figure for his hearers. But Cicero was an incomparable master of language, not an epitomator crushing the style out of the words of another. And how ruthlessly the author of the Oxyrhynchus Epitome has compressed Livy's account of this episode is shown by the detail with which Frontinus tells the story.

In general, the epitomator borrowed Livy's language, sometimes even phrases and clauses; but he frequently summarized longer accounts in his own words.³⁷ Examination of the first three columns of the Epitome, which cover Books xxxvii-xl and which thus permit comparison with Livy's own words, shows, however, that even when whole phrases are borrowed from Livy they are not reproduced intact. There is, therefore, no way of knowing what truncation Livy's phraseology has suffered in the Epitome's version of the events of 140 B.C. Livy very probably employed a word or phrase that softened the metaphor, as did Cicero in the passage cited above.³⁸ The epitomator

³⁶ *De har. resp.* 6.

³⁷ Grenfell and Hunt, *op. cit.*, p. 92. For the way in which the epitomator borrowed Livy's phrases compare Livy xl. 44. 1: "Eo anno rogatio primum lata est ab L. Villo tribuno plebis, quot annos nati quemque magistratum petere caperentque" with the Epitome's version (II. 78-80): "L. Livius trib. pl. quot [annos nati quemque] magistratum petere, rogavit. Annalis dictus est" (the text is Rossbach's, *op. cit.*). For the opposite practice compare Livy xxxvii. 57. 9-16 with the Epitome's summary (II. 8-10): "Glabrio] censuram petens minantibus [tes in the papyrus] [accus]ationem competitoribus [compellitoribus in the papyrus] proposito [composito in the papyrus] [destit]it."

³⁸ Rossbach believes (*op. cit.*, p. 142) that a faint dot above the *e* of *inae* and the *d* of *devota* in I. 188 indicates that something has dropped out of the line at this point. If Rossbach is right, it is possible that some word comparable to Cicero's *hostia* once stood in the text of the epitome. To the present writer, however, it seems most unlikely that the faint dot in question signals a textual disturbance as Rossbach believes. Rossbach's photographic facsimile shows clearly that the dot is not of the same intensity or quality of ink as the letters of text. Moreover, the dot, placed above, rather than between *e* and *d*, does not separate the letters. These facts suggest that, if the presence of the dot is not purely fortuitous, it was so placed by a later reader and not by the copyist who produced the

mator, concentrating upon the subject and the verb, as he does throughout, omitted it without in any way being distressed by the result. Newspaper reporters of modern speeches seem all too frequently to be cast from the same insensitive mold.

In any case, the epitomator cannot be held to the Ciceronian or Livian canon of Latinity. Kornemann has shown³⁹ that the Oxyrhynchus Epitome was not excerpted directly from Livy but from a summary composed in the second century A.D. which was arranged on a strictly chronological basis. This summary, in turn, was not drawn from Livy either but was derived from an epitome arranged according to subject matter rather than chronological sequence of events. The Latinity native to the author of the Oxyrhynchus Epitome was, therefore, that of the second century A.D. and not the Augustan period.

The writer believes, then, that the correct restoration of the five spaces following *cecidit* in line 188 is *M. Porcinae*. Frontinus makes it clear that it was he who had been the spokesman for the Aemilio-Marcian faction in 143 B.C. If he was actually the presiding officer at the time of the senate's debate on the report of

the decemviral college, as Münzer makes probable,⁴⁰ he was in a position to contribute more than his mere eloquence to the success of his party. There is nothing in the record to suggest that he was not also present in Rome in 140 B.C., when the second attack on the extension of the Marcia was made by the Cornelian faction.⁴¹ His advocacy, twice undertaken, of the Marcia despite the original designation of the Anio and despite the Sibylline ban against the Marcia was too effective to be met with argument. His opponents in desperation took cover in metaphor and tried to move the senate by picturing the Anio as a victim brought low by the machinations of Porcina.

The entire passage would then read:

Q. Occius

oppressus [i]n sidiis Lusitanorum fortissime cecidit. M. Porcinae devota est aqua Anio, aqua Marcia in Capitolium contra Sibyllae carmina perducta.]

This restoration has at least the merit of respecting space requirements, of joining precisely to the preserved portions of the line, and of conforming completely to the account that Frontinus gives. If it is correct, it adds to our knowledge of the career of M. Aemilius Lepidus Porcina the fact that he was again in 140 B.C., as he was in 143 B.C., the instrument of defeating the opponents of the extension of the Marcia to the Capitoline.

MERIWETHER STUART

HUNTER COLLEGE

³⁹ *Römische Adelsparteien*, p. 240.

⁴¹ For the identity of the objectors to the extension of the Marcia in 140 B.C. see *ibid.*, p. 241.

Oxyrhynchus Epitome and does not, therefore, furnish any evidence concerning the condition of the copy used by the scribe of the Oxyrhynchus exemplar. In any case, Rossbach's belief concerning the meaning of the dot is based on his study of the manuscripts of Florus (*cf.* p. xli of the Praefatio of his edition) rather than a study of practices of the Egyptian scribes of the fourth century A.D.

³⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 68-87.

CICERO DE NATURA DEORUM iii. 53 ff.

In the third book of *De natura deorum* Cotta, the pontifex and Academic skeptic, seeks to refute the Stoic system of theology which Balbus has set forth in the second book.¹ Yet,

¹ This, at least, is the idea and the program (see *ibid.* 1-10). Actually, Cotta again and again ignores what his adversary has said and attacks the Stoic system as such, irrespective of the specific form in which it was presented. See for some good observations on this question Ludwig Edelstein, *Stud. ital. di fil.*, XI (new ser., 1934), 131-83. I cannot, however, accept Mr. Edelstein's explanation.

not content with rejecting the Stoic doctrines, Cotta looks about for additional foes:

Dicamus igitur Balbe oportet contra illos etiam qui hos deos ex hominum genere in caelum translato non re sed opinione esse dicunt quos auguste omnes sancteque veneramur.²

The theory here attacked suggests that human beings were raised to the sky *non re sed opinione*. It must therefore be different from the

² *ibid.* 53.

doctrine which Cicero criticized at iii. 41,³ according to which outstanding benefactors of mankind like Hercules were actually (*re*) raised to the sky and added to the gods. The sentence which I have quoted⁴ refers, as Mayor⁴ has seen, to Euhemerus; for it was he who suggested that kings and warriors were, after their death, worshiped by their peoples and that their divinity was entirely a matter of *opinion* and had no basis in reality.⁵ Thus we expect to find Euhemerus and Euhemerism as objects of Cicero's criticism in the section to which our sentence is the introduction. The criticism begins:

Principio Ioves tres numerant i qui theologi nominantur, ex quibus primum et secundum natos in Arcadia, alterum patre Aethere . . . alterum patre Caelo, qui genuisse Minervam dicitur, . . . tertium Cretensem Saturni filium cuius in illa insula sepulcrum ostenditur. Dioscoroe etiam apud Graios multis modis nominantur.

As in these sentences, so in the whole section which extends down to 60, we are made familiar with ingenious distinctions made by the *theologi*. There is not one pair of Dioscoroe but three—with different parentage; not one Sol but five; not one Vulcanus but four; and so on. The "pluralistic" point of view is applied to most of the major figures of the Roman (or rather Greek) pantheon.⁶ At the end of the catalogue we read: "Atque haec quidem <ali-
(aque)>⁷ eius modi ex vetere Graeciae fama collecta sunt." If we ask by whom these items were collected, the answer is obviously contained in our first sentence: "i qui theologi nominantur." And at 42, where we are taught that there is more than one Hercules and where, incidentally, the method and the criteria of differentiation are exactly the same as in our section,⁸ the authors of these differenti-

ations are referred to as "i qui interiores scrutantur et reconditas litteras." Evidently some Hellenistic scholar and *theologus*—for the plural means little in such references—has applied the principle of plurality very thoroughly and systematically. Who it was we do not know; for, while there have been repeated attempts to trace the material in Cicero and similar differentiations which we find in other writers to one and the same authority,⁹ I have seen no suggestion as to this man's identity that I could regard as proved.

Now to what end does Cicero set forth all the details of this theological system? Why does he tell us so much about different *Ioves*, *Martes*, *Vulcani*, etc.? We have suggested above that the differentiations serve as an argument against Euhemerism, and this interpretation seems to me to represent the most obvious way of connecting the two successive sentences, which we have quoted at the beginning of this paper. Yet this is neither Mayor's nor Hirzel's¹⁰ view; for these two scholars think that the sentence *Principio Ioves tres*, etc., introduces, and that the whole section (53–60) constitutes, an account of the Euhemerist system, not its refutation. Mayor does not hesitate to identify "(illos) qui hos deos ex hominum genere in caelum translatos non re-

finds it necessary to transpose 53–60 before 43–52 so that it becomes the sequel to 42. He thinks that, besides the completely homogeneous character of 42 and 53–60, the words *ut iam docebo* at the end of 42 present an argument in favor of this transposition. I should not regard it as axiomatic that *iam* must be a reference to something that follows immediately, and I believe that the explanation of the difficulties in 53 ff. which I am going to offer will make it unnecessary to remove this section from its place in the manuscripts. That the arrangement of the material in this part of Book III is far from ideal will probably be admitted by most scholars who have examined it; but whether the scribes of ancient or of medieval manuscripts should be held responsible for the difficulties and disturbances which we observe is another question.

³ Cf. Mayor, *op. cit.*, III, 199–209; Rudolf Hirzel, *Sitz.-Ber. Saechs. Akad.*, 1896, pp. 277 ff.; Walter Michaelis, *De origine indicis deorum cognominum* (dissertation, Berlin, 1898). For more recent comments cf. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1931–32), II, 419 f. For the theology of Hellenistic scholars (as distinct from that of the philosophers) cf. esp. Felix Jacoby, *FGH*, Part II, Commentary, pp. 753 ff.

¹⁰ See nn. 4 and 9.

¹ See also II. 62.

² Joseph B. Mayor, *M. Tullii Ciceronis De natura deorum libri tres with Introduction and Commentary* (3 vols.; Cambridge, 1885), III, 111.

³ See *De nat. deor.* I. 119, and cf. in general Felix Jacoby's article, "Euhemerus," *RE*, s.v.

⁴ Notice also the inclusion of some Egyptian deities, esp. at 54, 55, 56, 59.

⁵ *Addidit Davisius*.

⁶ A distinction between two *Ἡρακλῆϊς* is found as early as Herodotus (II. 44). Mayor (*op. cit.*, III, 110 f.)

sed opinione esse dicunt" and "i qui theologi nominantur." He does not seem to be aware of the difficulties involved in this attempt. Did Euhemerus "scrutari interiores et reconditas litteras"? Did he collect material "e vetere Graeciae fama"? If Cicero (and his Cotta) disapproved so vigorously of the Euhemerist approach, would he use it ten paragraphs earlier (at 42) to discredit another philosophic theology? Finally—and this is most important—the section (53–60) which Mayor wants us to read as an account of Euhemerus' theory includes at best one item that may remind us of Euhemerus¹¹ but represents a theological approach altogether different from that of Euhemerus. Euhemerus is known for his explanation of the gods as deified kings or army leaders; our *theologus* distinguishes between different *Ioves*, *Martes*, etc., but allows for them divine parents. In fact, he has good orthodox divine pedigrees, and it is not at all his ideas that "viri aut fortes aut clari aut potentes post mortem ad deos pervenerunt" but rather that gods are those who are born of gods. Thus Mayor's theory must be rejected. In fact, we cannot even compromise with it by accepting his—or Hirzel's—suggestion¹² that the *theologi* are a later school or "variety" of

¹¹ I refer to the *sepulchra* of Zeus and Asklepios (53, 57; cf. I. 119). I notice with interest that Jacoby in his article on Euhemerus (see n. 5) has judiciously refrained from referring to our section of the *De natura deorum*.

¹² Mayor, *op. cit.*, III, 111: "The mythologists referred to are plainly Euhemerists like Diodorus." This comment reveals more clearly than any other passage in his commentary what Mayor had in mind, but it does not improve his position. It is quite true that in Diodorus we find deifications of kings (esp. in his Egyptian history in Book I) as well as distinctions between different *Διόνυσους* and the like (esp. in his Greek mythology in Book IV). These facts are of considerable interest to the students of his sources—I am not sure that the "Euhemerism" of Book I has been taken into account by those scholars who think that the whole book goes back to Hecataeus of Abdera—but they do not suggest that Diodorus himself represents a specific variety of Euhemerism. Hirzel (*op. cit.*; cf. n. 9) comes at times close to what I consider the correct view (p. 277: "Bruchstück einer Theologie, das freilich der Ankuendigung nicht genau entspricht"; *ibid.*: "Von der Apotheose verstorbener Menschen ist darin wenig, ausdrucklich sogar nirgends die Rede"); but his arguments are too vague to support his contention that at Cicero's time there was a new school of "Euhemerist" theologians who were at the same time Athenian patriots.

Euhemerists; for Cotta promises to speak against those "qui deos . . . in caelum translatos non re sed opinione esse dicunt," and nowhere in our section do we read anything that might illustrate this proposition.

Thus we come back to our original interpretation and look at 53–60 once more as a refutation of Euhemerism. Yet this view, too, has its difficulties. First of all, how can the "pluralistic" theory serve as a refutation of Euhemerism? Does Cicero suggest that Euhemerus has at best accounted for one Jupiter, one Vulcanus etc., whereas the *theologi* know three or more different ones? If this was his idea, he has certainly not made it very clear. Moreover, if we read our section as Cotta's refutation of Euhemerism, a great surprise is in store for us at the end, where Cotta suddenly describes these differentiations as an aberration and declares that one must oppose them: "quibus intelligis resistendum esse ne perturbentur religiones." What a curious situation! The pluralistic point of view had been brought in to refute Euhemerism, and now, all of a sudden, the same speaker turns round and attacks the pluralistic point of view. Has he forgotten the purpose for which the whole catalogue had been brought in?

"Verum operi longo fas est obrepere somnum." Some inadvertence—of Cicero himself—must be surmised if we are to explain the difficulty at all, and fortunately Cicero's reputation as a missionary of Greek culture is now so well established that no number of newly discovered mistakes or inaccuracies can upset it. Cicero had evidently made extracts of a pluralistic system of theology¹³ and meant to use them in the *De natura deorum*. He used part of them at 42 to support the skeptical arguments against the divinity of Hercules. Yet the bulk of his notes could not be employed there, and it lay in the nature of the

¹³ The question as to whether he found this material in his main source—the work of a man who must have belonged to the school of Carneades—has been vigorously discussed (see esp. Hirzel, *op. cit.*, pp. 303 f.), and the possibility that he did cannot be altogether excluded. If so, we should, of course, like to know to what end the material was used by Cicero's authority; but it seems futile to attempt a discussion of this question.

material that it could equally well be used as target or as weapon. Since Cicero felt that he—or his Cotta—did not like the pluralistic approach because it was detrimental to the established cults,¹⁴ he appended an expression of disapproval to the extracts. Yet, if Cicero did not confine his criticism in Book iii to the orthodox Stoic system but included the pluralistic *theologi*, he could just as well go a step further and include also Euhemerus. With this intention, he wrote the sentence "Dicamus igitur Balbe oportet contra illos etiam," etc., but failed to work out the actual polemic which would probably have followed the lines of i. 117-19—though we are also free to surmise that it was because of the polemical remarks against Euhemerus in Book i that those planned for Book iii were not worked out. In any case, he had written the sentence which was meant to introduce the polemic against

Euhemerus and had written the account of the pluralistic theory, ending, it is true, in its condemnation—but only after a long exposition had been given—and through an inadvertence the account became the sequel to the sentence. It is, in fact, possible to read the differentiations between *Ioves*, *Martes*, etc., and to feel more or less vaguely that they refute Euhemerus, until one arrives at 60 and realizes that the supposed refutation is itself to be condemned. Cicero failed to notice the mistake before the work went to Atticus. If it is true that none of his readers has hitherto noticed it, so much the more excuse is there for him.

This is not the only instance of inadvertence in our book,¹⁵ and it will probably now be generally admitted that if Cicero revised the *De natura deorum* at all he must have done so rather hastily.

FRIEDRICH SOLMSSEN

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

¹⁴ Perhaps also because the Stoics (whom Cotta attacks) had shown some interest in these differentiations. The words which suggest this are, however, rather vague (60 *fin.*).

¹⁵ Cf. O. Plasberg's and W. Ax's comments in the Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1933), pp. iv, 207, and *passim*.

DIONYSIUS ON SATURNIAN VERSE

Post's attractive emendation of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Antiq.* vii. 72. 11), incorporated in the fourth volume of the "Loeb" *Dionysius* and defended in *Classical Weekly*, XXXVII (October 18, 1943), 27, may raise doubts unless it is given a different interpretation from that which its author suggests. Dionysius, in trying to prove that the Romans were of Greek origin, as shown by their customs, presents a detailed description of the parade preceding the Circus games. Then he observes that the comic, satyr-like element of the Circus parade occurs in the triumphal procession too.¹ In Post's reading there is a contrast between the earlier custom of the Romans of making fun of the triumphing general and that of Dionysius' day: *πρότερον ἀμέτροις σκώμμασι παρορχομένοις, νῦν δὲ ποιήματα ἔδουσιν αὐτοσχέδια*. Post's emendation consists in changing *ἅμα τοῖς ἀμέτροις*; the

whole passage is translated in the "Loeb" volume as follows:

For the soldiers who take part in the triumphs are allowed to satirise and ridicule the most distinguished men, including even the generals, in the same manner as those who ride in procession in carts at Athens; the soldiers once jested in prose as they clowned, but now they sing improvised verses.

The weakness of this interpretation is that from no other source do we learn that the jesting was ever in prose; on the contrary, verse is always mentioned. My suggestion is that perhaps *ἀμέτροις* should be interpreted as meaning in bad or rough meter, in the sense of *κακόμετρος*. I can quote no Greek parallel for this meaning of *ἀμέτρος*, but such a use of alpha privative is so common that it scarcely needs justification; cf. *ἄβουλος*, "ill-advised," *ἄσημος* glossed by *κακόσημος* in Sophocles, *ἄξερος*, etc. This would fit such early verse forms as the Fescennines in Saturnian meter and would come close to such

¹ In *Class. Phil.*, IX (1914), 1, I pointed out the relation of this passage in Dionysius to Livy's history of the Roman drama (vii. 2).

Latin adjectives as *rudis*, *incompositus*. So Livy (vii. 2. 7): "Fescennino versu similem incompositum temere ac rudem." Horace calls the Saturnian meter *horridus* (*Ep.* ii. 1. 157). Terentianus designates it as *rudem sonum* (VI, p. 400. 2507 K.). Caesius Bassus says that the Saturnian verses written by the ancients were *durissimos* (VI, p. 265. 13 K.; followed by Victorinus in VI, p. 139. 4 K.) and *asperrimi* (VI, p. 266. 4 K.). Fortunatianus uses the expression *sine cura* (VI, p. 293. 27 K.). Servius interprets Virgil's *versibus incomptis* (*G.* ii. 386) as an allusion to the Saturnian meter.

Even more enlightening is what one finds in the writers on rhetoric and metrics as to the difference between prose and verse—and let us not forget that Dionysius was a rhetorician as well as a historian. In his *Rhetoric* Aristotle says that prose should be neither metrical nor unrhythmical (iii. 8. 1). Cicero quotes this with approval (*Or.* 172). In the same way it might be said that some forms of verse are rhythmical and yet not entirely metrical. Cicero observes that lyric poetry is not easy to distinguish from prose when the musical accompaniment is omitted (*ibid.* 183–84). Dionysius himself says practically the same thing: "Lyric poets may mix many meters and rhythms, causing us to overlook the meter and producing something much like prose" (*Comp.* 26). In comedy, Cicero continues in the *Orator*, the senarius is so like prose that often it is impossible to perceive either the rhythm (*numerus*) or the meter (*versus*). Cicero's contemporary, Laberius, writes: "Versorium, non numerorum numero studuimus." Servius remarks that the *vulgares* used to com-

pose Saturnians "ad rhythmum solum" (*G.* ii. 385). The Roman grammarians called all verse that they could not scan "rhythm."²

Most enlightening of all, and decisive for our interpretation of Dionysius, is a difficult fragmentary passage in Charisius (I, p. 288. 1 K.), which I discovered almost at the end of my investigation. In discussing the Saturnian meter Charisius writes:

Sunt item Saturnii quinum denum et senum denum pedum, in quibus similiter novum genus pedum est et ipsum ameton.

Whatever the interpretation we give to these words and whatever text we adopt for the rest of the sentence, which I have not quoted,³ we see that Dionysius' word ἀμετρος is applied to the Saturnian meter.

My interpretation of Dionysius as emended by Post seems to me to be a guaranty of the correctness of the emendation. But Post has not merely offered a neat emendation; he has also restored the manuscript reading παρορχουμένοις, emended away by other editors, though in its context it would seem to be essential. The dictionaries give only one other instance of the word, and that in a different sense. Here it is probably used as a parallel to παρωδῶ. The phrase σκώμμασι παρορχουμένοις is similar to σκωπτικῶς παρωδῆσας in Eustathius (on *Il.* i. 1). Both movements and words were involved in the burlesquing of the triumphal procession.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

² Lucian Mueller, *Der Saturnische Vers und seine Denkmäler* (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 12, 14.

³ In his Teubner edition of 1925 Barwick adopts an emendation of Leo's.

ON READING VON DUHN

A statue in the Louvre was published¹ with a caption, according to which it is probably a Niobid and probably belonged to a pediment. In view of its resemblance in style to the frieze of the temple at Bassai, I suggested² that it

¹ *Encyclopédie photographique de l'art, Musée du Louvre*, III (1938), 177.

² *AJA*, 1943, p. 17.

might belong to one of the pediments of that temple. Dinsmoor³ acutely traced the history of the statue, finding that, beyond reasonable doubt, it was one of two somewhat similar figures that had once been in the Miollis collection in Rome and had subsequently been seen

³ *AJA*, 1943, pp. 20 f.

in another collection by von Duhn.⁴ Von Duhn states that the marble is Greek; and this is naturally not unfavorable, as far as it goes, to a connection with Bassai. He also says, of the companion piece specifically, that it was designed to be seen only from the front: a feature proper to pedimental sculptures and not to many others. Furthermore, he makes clear that the entire upper part of the Louvre figure is modern. This is not surprising, since that part seems to show the influence of Roman sarcophagi; and the part left as antique may truly be described as identical in style with the Bassai frieze.

Dinsmoor writes: "Von Duhn gives the total height from the bottom of the plinth to the top of the restored modern head in the other example as only 1.30 m." The full text of von Duhn's statement on this matter is: "H. etwa 1.30." That this estimate was intended to include the plinth is improbable, first, because von Duhn constantly gives dimensions in terms applicable to the figure only (Lgr., über Lgr., Halbe Lgr., etc.) and, second, because he says that the plinth is modern. The importance of this matter lies in the fact that the two figures are similar in size; their scale is not large for the Bassai pediment and would become still smaller if the heights given for the Louvre figure (1.14 m.) and by von Duhn for the other were understood to include the plinths.

Dinsmoor also writes:

The three-stepped pyramid resulting from the block on which the left foot is placed, the lower but very formal rectangular plinth under the main part of the statue (quite unsuitable for fifth-century pedimental statues), and the continuous formal plinth, 0.11–0.12 m. high, set into the cutting along the bottom of the tympanum at Bassai, would form a most improbable composition.

Inasmuch as von Duhn found the plinth to be modern in the Louvre statue as well as in the companion piece, its formality and all other qualities are matters of pure conjecture. The

blocks on which the raised feet were placed are also largely modern and their exact form wholly uncertain.

"In any case, the existence of an identical pair of statues in any Greek pediment is almost inconceivable." If it be conceded that two marble figures may be identical, and furthermore that two figures turned in opposite directions may be identical, it is still quite clear from von Duhn that the two figures in question are not identical. They differ in rendering of drapery and in actual costume also; for the Louvre statue wears a peplos and nothing else, as far as can be discerned, whereas the companion figure wears a linen chiton with an outer garment visible in front on the right thigh. That two figures, corresponding to the extent that these correspond, should be present in a Greek pediment is as far as possible from inconceivable. With two figures that appear to belong together and no more, one could indeed think of lateral akroteria; but, in general, weathering and treatment of the back make it easy to distinguish akroteria from pedimental figures. Apparently these features of the figure in the Louvre suggested to the editor of the *Encyclopédie photographique* that it belonged to a pediment, and, as has been noted, von Duhn's testimony in regard to the other statue indicates the same conclusion.

The close stylistic relation of the Louvre figure to the Bassai frieze is a fact of considerable interest, since stone sculptures in this style are exceedingly scarce. It is to be hoped that the companion statue can be found and published, since it seems likely that its relation would be equally close. The suggestion that the Louvre figure, or now both, belonged to the Bassai pediment was and remains a conjecture, which may quite possibly be disproved by the depth of the figure or weakened by its small size, when these factors are accurately known. But all information gleaned from von Duhn is favorable to the conjecture; and it is still true that, if the Louvre statue belonged to any temple, it ought to have belonged to the temple at Bassai.

F. P. JOHNSON

⁴ Matz-Duhn, *Antike Bildwerke in Rom*, I, 250 f., Nos. 932–33.

THE CONSUALIA OF DECEMBER

There are in the Roman calendar two days known as the *Consualia*—the twenty-first of August and the fifteenth of December.¹ Both appear to be festivals of Consus. The etymology of the god's name,² combined with the date of the first festival, suggests that in August the *Consualia* is a harvest celebration in honor of the storing of the grain.³ The occurrence of the same title for the sacred day in December presents something of a problem. It is hard to see why one should celebrate the harvest a second time at the beginning of the winter season. Warde Fowler says: "We might guess that these winter rites of Consus arose from the habit of inspecting the condition of the corn stores in mid-winter."⁴ But this is only a guess; and, since the farmer probably inspected the state of his grain stores every time he drew some out, it seems unlikely that the habit required a special ceremony on a special day.

The word *Consualia*, scholarly opinion is generally agreed, is associated with harvesting and storing away. One ancient crop was, how-

ever, gathered in December and, as a matter of fact, still is today—the olive crop.⁵ Olives can have been only slightly less important than grain in the Roman economy, as they were the main source of oil. I would therefore suggest that their harvesting was of sufficient note to be marked out by a special festival in December. Since the culture of the olive was introduced into Italy later than that of grain, we need not be surprised to find the festival of the olive modeled on an already existent harvest festival in August.⁶

AGNES KIRSOPP MICHELS

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

¹ On the olive in antiquity see A. S. Pease, *RE*, s.v. "Ölbaum." For the date of the harvest in antiquity see *CIL*, I, 1^a, 281 (*CIL*, VI, 2305, 2306). Columella *RR* xii, 52; Cato *De agricultura* 65; Vergil *Georgics* i, 305–6.

² Fenestella (quoted by Pliny *NH* xv, 1) tells us that olive trees did not exist in Italy before the time of Tarquinius Priscus, which perhaps leaves little time for a festival connected with them to find a place in the capital-letter calendar. Altheim tells us that the earliest calendar represents the period of the city before the Forum was drained and the Capitolium built, that is, before the Etruscans "systematized" the city (*Römische Religionsgeschichte*, I, 56–59; *A History of Roman Religion*, pp. 129–32). The actual codification of the native calendar must have taken place under the Etruscan domination, but before the foreign kings had brought about their most radical changes in the appearance of the city or made any material changes in the state cults, such as the introduction of the Capitoline Triad. This would mean that, if we must believe Fenestella, the olive harvest might still have just squeezed into the old calendar before the Tarquins "froze" it.

¹ *CIL*, I, 1^a, pp. 326, 337; Aust, *RE*, s.v. "Consualia."

² Mommsen, *CIL*, I, 1^a, p. 326; Aust, *RE*, s.v. "Consus"; G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, p. 201; W. Schulze, *Zur Gesch. lat. Eigennamen*, p. 474, n. 5.

³ Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 202; Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals of the Republic*, p. 206. For a different point of view see A. Piganiol, *Recherches sur les jeux romains* (Columbia University Press, 1923), pp. 1–14.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 267–68.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Indo-Hittite Laryngeals. By E. H. STURTEVANT. ("William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series," Linguistic Society of America.) Baltimore, Md.: Waverly Press, Inc., 1942. Pp. 103.

In this book Professor Sturtevant condenses the results of several years of work of his own and of other scholars¹ on a new doctrine—the "laryngeal theory"—which claims to explain a great many of the facts of Hittite and Indo-European phonology.

This so-called "laryngeal" theory is based exclusively on Hittite evidence: no other Indo-European language shows a direct proof or trace of such a sound or class of sounds. This Professor Sturtevant himself asserts without any hesitation:

Although the former existence of the laryngeals was suggested by some scholars before the discovery of the Hittite documents, it is only these documents that provide indubitable (!) evidence for them; a strict application of the comparative method to the IE data available during the nineteenth century [and even until 1917—G. B.] could not prove their existence. . . . Consequently the founders of IE comparative grammar, for the most part [?], make no mention of laryngeals; no such consonants appear in the handbooks of Brugmann, Hirt, Meillet, etc. This is as it should be. In my opinion Proto-IE as reconstructed in the nineteenth century can stand with only minor changes; cf. [82–84]. The laryngeals belong rather to [Indo]-H[ittite] [p. 15; cf. also pp. 23, §13; 27, §19; 66, §67].

Therefore, no demonstration of the existence of laryngeals can be given from the point of view of IE alone; we have to rely exclusively on Hittite.

Now what are the position and the respective importance of Hittite with relation to what Professor Sturtevant calls "Indo-European" (a term which in his terminology includes all of the Indo-European languages, in-

clusive, I suppose, of Tocharian, known prior to the discovery of Hittite)? This is, of course, under these conditions a matter of primary importance, since it is obvious that it would be rather dangerous to construct such a complicated and far-reaching theory as the "laryngeal" one on the basis exclusively of one of the eleven or thirteen "IE" languages (if we include Hittite), particularly if we consider that Hittite is by no means, from the point of view of linguistic geography, an isolated area, but just the contrary (cf., e.g., Bonfante, *IF*, LII [1934], 221 ff.; LV [1937], 131 ff.). The laryngeal theory is therefore closely related to Sturtevant's Indo-Hittite theory,² according to which Hittite is not an Indo-European language like Greek, Latin, or Slavic, but a sort of sister-language of Indo-European as a whole (it would be, therefore, in the same relation to the reconstructed, primitive Indo-European as Greek is to Latin and to Slavic). Under these circumstances, of course, Hittite would assume (so to speak) a hierarchically superior position, and its testimony would weigh far more heavily than that of any IE language or even than that of any group of IE languages. Unfortunately, the Indo-Hittite theory has failed to convince the great majority of scholars, and in particular the scholars who study the Hittite problem, as Sturtevant himself quite openly admits (p. 24, § 14); and even the new presentation of his arguments on pages 23 ff. (§§ 15 ff.) of his present books fails to convince me.³ Therefore, for the Indo-

¹ Cf. Sturtevant, p. 23, § 13: "A fundamental (!) assumption of this book is that Hitt. is not one of the IE languages but a member of a small group of Anatolian languages, which includes the language of the so-called Hittite hieroglyphic writing, Luwian, Lycian, and Lydian. Proto-Anatolian and Proto-IE are parallel offshoots of a common ancestral language, which we shall call Indo-Hittite. Since Hittite is the only Anatolian language of which we have extensive knowledge, we shall generally have to ignore the others."

² Against the Indo-Hittite theory, implicitly or explicitly, are (apart from Hrozný, Marstrand, Sapir, and Kurylowicz): Pedersen, *Groupement des dialectes*

¹ To the bibliography we should now add G. van Langenhove, *Linguistische Studien*, II (Anvers, 1939), which I reviewed in *Classical Weekly*, XXXV (1941–42), 149 ff.

Hittite theory we are referred again to the laryngeals; far from being itself a pillar of the laryngeal theory, the Indo-Hittite theory needs the laryngeal theory as evidence—nay, it seems to me, as the sole possible evidence. Let us therefore proceed to the analysis of this theory itself.

As I have said, laryngeals do not exist in any Indo-European language, nor are they to be found in the usual manuals of reconstructed Indo-European (Meillet, Hirt, Buck, Schrijnen, Meringer, Kieckers, etc.). According to Sturtevant, they existed once but disappeared later (already in the Proto-Indo-European epoch). Our chief evidence seems, therefore, to be that *two* of Sturtevant's *four* supposed laryngeals are preserved in Hittite, under certain conditions, under the form of *h* or *hh*. Is this evidence convincing?

When a linguistic phonetic theory is presented, obviously everything hinges upon the validity of the etymologies which support it. Phonetic "rules" live in words, not outside them. Unless a reasonable number of flawless etymologies is given, on which we may base a new phonetic "rule," we are bound to remain

skeptical. In fact, the modern tendency in linguistics, and particularly in Indo-European linguistics, is to be more and more cautious in accepting etymologies. Hundreds, thousands, of etymologies which were accepted or at least seriously discussed at the end of the last century and listed, e.g., in the "old" Walde, are completely forgotten now. This is a quite wholesome tendency. Meillet used to say that, unless an etymology is immediately evident, it must not be accepted. He faithfully followed this rule in his wonderful *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* and was criticized, if I remember correctly, only for not having been strict enough. Now, are Sturtevant's etymologies certain? How many of them can be called "immediately evident," in the same way as, let us say, that of *πατήρ*: *father*, *θυγάτηρ*: *daughter*, *τρῆς*: *três*: *three*? Can the rules of the laryngeals be compared, e.g., with the *Lautverschiebung*, which is based on hundreds of unimpeachable comparisons of words? I know very well that this is to a large extent a subjective question; but still I must state frankly that many—too many—of the etymologies presented by Sturtevant seem to me, either in meaning or in form or in both, highly hypothetical. Grave doubts about Sturtevant's etymologies have already been expressed by Meillet (*BSL*, XXXV [1935], n. 30) and by Lohmann (*IF*, LI [1933], 327 ff.; *LIV* [1936], 286 ff.). I am by no means convinced by the comparisons he proposes for *parhh-*, *tarhh-*, *túhhs-*, *hulla-*, *hameshas*, *hark-*, *harra-*, *hurn-*, *huske-*, *hves-*, *hanza*,⁴ and many

indoeuropéens (1925), p. 44; *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeur. Spr.* (1933), p. 190; *Festschrift Hirt*, II (1936), 582 f.; *Tocharisch* (1941), pp. 4 f. and 261; A. Berriedale Keith, *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XIII (1937), 3 ff. and 19; XIV (1938), 201–23; Benveniste, *BSL*, XXXIII (1932), 143; *ibid.*, XXXIX (1938), c.r., 26; Pisanì, *Preistoria delle lingue indoeuropee* ("Mem. R. Accad. dei Lincei," ser. 6, Vol. IV, Fasc. 6 [1933]), pp. 636 ff.; Lohmann, *IF*, LIV (1936), 291 ff.; W. Petersen, *AJP*, LIII (1932), 193 ff.; *Language*, X (1934), 205 ff.; Manson, *Mélanges Pedersen* (1937), pp. 486 f.; Meillet, *BSL*, XXXII (1931), 1 ff.; c.r., 57 (who is not at all "zweifeln," as S. Feist, *Got. Wb.*, v. villi n. pretends!); *ibid.*, XXXV (1934), c.r., 28 ff.; *Introduction* (1934), pp. 56 and 497; Bártoli, *Archivio glottologico italiano*, XXV (1931–33), 11, 19, and 29; XXVII (1935), 197 ff.; XXIX (1937), 49 ff.; *ibid.*, XXX (1938), 56 ff.; *Studi albanesi*, II (1932), 11; Devoto, *Storia della lingua di Roma* (1940), pp. 3 ff. and 16 ff. We have—with Meillet, Marstrand, Devoto, Pedersen, Benveniste, Bártoli—the greatest authorities of the comparative Indo-European field in recent years. This theory was first presented by E. Forrer, *MDOG*, LXI (1921), 26 f. (cf. also Mannus, XXVI [1934], 115 ff.) and accepted by Ungnad, *ZA*, I (new ser., 1923), 3 f. But neither of them is an authority in Indo-European linguistics. I myself have always clearly opposed the "Indo-Hittite" hypothesis; cf. *Emerita*, I (1933), 164 f., and 189 and III (1935), 168; *IF*, LII (1934), 221 ff., and LV (1937), 131 ff.; *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, XVIII (1939), 381 ff.; *Archiv Orientalni*, XI (1939), 84–90.

⁴ For *hanza*, "front," *hantezis*, "first" (p. 40; cf. also *Comp. Hitt. Gr.*, p. 87), I would say that Pedersen's comparison with Welsh *cynaf*, "first," Gaulish *Cintu-gnatus*, proposed by him in *Groupelement des dialectes indo-européens* (*Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabsnævn Selskab, Historisk-filol. Meddelelser*, XI, 3 [1925]), p. 42 (and repeated in *Litteris*, V [1928], 159) is at least as good as Sturtevant's. For the correspondence Hitt. *h* = IE *k* we could compare, e.g., Hitt. *halkis*, "Getreide" = OCSlav. *slakū*, Phrygian *ῥάκια* *lákia* (cf. Pedersen, *Hittitisch*, p. 177); *hastai* = OCSlav. *košl*, and the ending *-ha-*: Gr. *-xa* of the first person of the perfect. Cf. also Petersen, *JAS*, LIX (1939), 186 ff.; Marstrand, *Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap*, III (1929), 294; Forrer, *RHA*, I (1930–32), 144 ff. I want to stress that I do not believe at all that Hitt. *h* = IE *k*, *g* (they give *k* in Hittite, as Sturtevant states in his *Grammar*); I merely mention these cases in order to show how easy it is to construct "phonetic laws" on the basis of a few occurrences.

other words. I do not mean that they should not be considered and discussed, but I do not think that they furnish a secure basis for such a far-reaching theory as the one Sturtevant advances. Some etymologies are somewhat more attractive (I would by no means say sure) and have been accepted or considered by other scholars: so, e.g., *harkis*, "white": Gr. ἀργός; *hastai*, "bone": Gr. ὀστέον; *haras*, "eagle": OHG *aro*, Germ. *Adler*; *hasdwer*: Gr. ὄζος, Germ. *Ast*;⁵ but are they sufficient for the purpose? May we construct a new theory of such great consequence merely because of Slavic *kostl*: Skt. *ásthi*; Slavic *kamy*: Gr. ἄκμων; Gr. κάπρος: Lat. *aper*; Goth. *hausjan*: *auso*, or because of the movable *s*- of Lat. *speciō*: Skt. *paśyāmi*, or the doublets πόλις: πτόλις; πόλεμος: πτόλεμος or the *v*- of Lith. *vienas*: Lat. *ūnus*, or the *j*- of Slav. *jagŋe*: Lat. *agnus* or the alternances like *s:sw*, *s:sy*, and similar cases, which are frequent in Indo-European? It is known that *h* in particular is a weak sound in almost all languages in which it appears, and such oscillations or "irrational" forms as Greek ὀρός, ἴσος and ἕτος, ἕτος and ἕρος, etc., Lat. *ānser*, *olus*, *harēna*, *herus*, *hūmidus*, *hūmor*, *herctum*, *humerus*, *haud*, *hālō*, *haurire*, *hauēre*, etc. (cf. Sommer, *Hb.*²⁻³, pp. 193 ff.; Walde-Hofmann, *s.uu.*), Neopersonian *hast*, "eight," are frequent. As for the *h* between vowels, I think we should consider with the greatest care the remark of Brandenstein:

So zeigt das Heth[itische] in gewissen Verbindungen ein *h*, das in allen andern idg. Sprachen (also noch im Gemeinidg.) verloren gegangen sein müsste. Indes darf nicht auszer Acht gelassen werden, dass es sich dabei um orthographische Angelegenheiten handelt. Heth. *pahur* entspricht *pūp* [read *pūp*], *Feuer*, die das mittlere *h* nicht aufweisen; doch dürfte die Sache hier so sein, dass *h* deswegen geschrieben wurde, um anzuzeigen, dass es sich bei *a-u* um zwei Vokale (oder einen Diphthong) handelt, nicht aber um eine Lautfolge *aw*.⁶ Das hethitische *h*

⁵ I will remark, moreover, that even these words do not lead to uniformity: ὄζος and ὀρίων have *o*- but ὄριος has *a*-!

⁶ This idea was first expressed by Marstrand in *Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap*, III (1929), 294; repeated (without mention of the former) in *AJP*, LIII (1932), 198 ff., and again in *Language*, IX (1933), 24 and 30, by Petersen, who cites, e.g., *pahhur*, *dahhi*,

scheint überhaupt mehrdeutig zu sein [*Festschrift Hirt*, II, 34].

We may recall the identical fact in Umbrian *ahesnes*, *stahu*, Lat. *ahēnus* (attested in an inscription of 186 B.C. [*CIL*, I², 581. 26] in an epoch when most likely initial *h*- was pronounced), *Lahis*, *dehe* = *deae*, *ohe* (cf. Sommer, *Hb.*²⁻³, pp. 192 f.; Ernout, *Les Éléments dialectaux du vocabulaire latin*, pp. 96 f.). In this way several other words besides *pahhur* cited by Sturtevant can be explained, without any laryngeals, e.g., *mehur*, *sehur*, *ehuratis*, *lahhu*, *lahha*, *huhhas*, etc. (although the last three etymologies seem doubtful; the first two are more plausible).⁷ In addition, I myself suggested in *Emerita*, IV (1936), 161, that Hitt. *h*, after a vowel, might be a sign of long quantity: for this we have analogies in Latin (*eh*, *CIL*, IV, 1112; *ah*, cf. *ēcastor*, *ohē*, Gr. ἡ ἡ σῶπα, Skt. *ā*), in French (*ah!*), Italian (*ah!* *oh!*), Hungarian (*oh!*), and, above all, in German (*ah!*, *Wahl*, *nehmen*, *Ahn*, *hohl*, *Ahle*, *prahlen*, *gehn*, *mehr*, etc.). The last language is particularly interesting, in the first place, because in it *h* preserves at the same time, in initial position, its full value as an aspiration: *Hund*, *Heer*, *Haus*, *Hölle*, etc.; in the second place, because it also marks the long quantity of the vowel in another way, namely, through doubling of the vowel: *Heer*, *Haar*, *Saat*, *Aal*, *Meer* (cf. *mehr*), etc. If, therefore, it should be proved some day—as already seems not unlikely—that Hittite marked long quantity by writing a double vowel (*e-es*, *da-a-an*, *wa-a-as*, etc.), this would not contradict at all my hypothesis of the lengthening value of the *h*.⁸

memahhi; and then in 1936 by Brandenstein as quoted above. Cf. also Hrozný, *Sprache der Hethiter*, p. 69. Sturtevant ignores all this.

⁷ As Dr. Gelb kindly informs me, a secondary *h* is frequent in Semitic languages, e.g., in Proto-Semitic **ilāhun*, Heb. *bāndh*, etc. It is true that in **ilāhun* the *h* was really pronounced, but that does not change the main point, since it is surely secondary. Maybe in *pahhur* the *hh* was also pronounced; but what is important is that it does not represent an original laryngeal, but merely a secondary "gleitkonsonant" with the function of separating the two vowels.

⁸ This hypothesis was first expressed by me, I believe, in *Emerita*, IV (1936), 161; V (1937), 167; then by A. B. Keith in *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XIV (1938), 203, who apparently did not know my works (he cites as examples *lahha* = Gr. *lāos*, *newah* =

We may apply this suggestion, e.g., to *pahs-*, "protect": Lat. *pāstor*, *pāscō*, *pābulum*, Skt. *pāti*; *tuhhs-*, "smoke" (?): Gr. *θῦμός* (an uncertain comparison); *nah-mi*, "I fear": Old Ir. *nār*, "bashful"; to all the denominative verbs in *-ahh-*, corresponding to Latin *-ā-re*, like *newahh-*: Lat. *nouāre* (and so *arawahh-*, *italawahh-*, *katterahh-*: paradigm *italawahmi*, *italawahi*, etc.); perhaps also to *lahha-*, *pahhur*⁹ (gen. *pahhwenas*), *ehuratis*, *mehur*, *sehur*, *pehute-*, *huhhas*, *lahhu-*, if this explanation is preferred to that given above (as a matter of fact, a long vowel is to be expected in the first five words; cf. Gr. *lāōs*; Goth. *fōn*; Gr. *ώτός*; Lat. *mētior*, Skt. *māti*; Lat. *sēmen*, OIcel. *sǫrr*, OCSlav. *syřū*, etc.). In any case, there is no contradiction between the two.

I do not propose these explanations as definitive solutions of even a part of the cases involved in the complicated problems raised by the question of Hittite *h*; I present them merely in order to show that alternative solutions, much simpler than the complicated laryngeal theory, are possible. Of course, I am fully aware that simple and modest explanations are too prosaic to attract any attention from some contemporary Indo-Europeanists, who are allured only by the romantic appeal of gigantic and majestic constructions, even if the real foundation for such enormous structures is extremely weak. But the truth is often dull and prosaic; like Maeterlinck's blue bird, it is frequently quite near to us, and we do not see it. It is a matter of the old, despised, gray, and unattractive common sense.

As for the first and second "Indo-Hittite" laryngeals, the evidence is purely negative, as Sturtevant himself declares (pp. 42, 53); these two phonemes have left neither in Hittite nor in Indo-European "any trace that can be

recognized." Here some Hittite etymologies (not all) are very good, such as *appa-*, "again," "back": Skt. *āpa*, Gr. *ἀπό*, Lat. *ab*; *taya-*, "theft": Skt. *tāyās*, OCSlav. *tajq*; *maklanza*, "leanness": Gr. *μακρός*, Lat. *macer*; *awan*, preposition: Skt. *āva*, Lat. *au-*; *epp-*, *app-* "begin": Skt. *āpnōti*, Lat. *apīscor*, *coēpi*; *es-*, *as-*, "set," "sit": Skt. *āste*, Gr. *ἵσται*; *nai-*, *ne-*, "lead": Skt. *nāyati*, *nināya*, etc.; *te-*, *dai-*, "place": Gr. *τίθημι*, Skt. *ādhyāyi*, *adhītām*; *-er*, ending of the 3d plur. pret.: Skt. *-ur*, *-ire*, *-re*, Avest. *-are*, Toch. *-re*, Lat. *-ēre*; *es-*, *as-*, "to be": Gr. *ἐσ-τί*, Lat. *es-t*, etc.; *et-*, *at-*, "eat": Gr. *ἔδομαι*, Lat. *edō*, etc.¹⁰ But what do they prove? They would be—they are, in fact—excellent etymologies without any intervention of the laryngeal theory. The supposition that they once contained a laryngeal is supported by no visible, concrete evidence; it is based merely on the theoretical system elaborated by Sturtevant.

What puzzles me above all is the protean character of these hypothetical laryngeals.¹¹ It is simply amazing to see how many things they do.¹² They change into Hitt. *h*; they disappear under the most different circumstances; they change *e* to *a*, but sometimes they do not; they combine to give *k* (pp. 42, 87); they produce rough breathing in Greek

¹⁰ The same can be said of some words listed on pp. 58–59: Hitt. *alpas*, "cloud": Lat. *albus*, Gr. *ἀλφός*; Hitt. *wessa-*, "put on (clothes)": Gr. *ἐνδύω*, *ἐνδύωμαι*, Skt. *vāste*; Lat. *ager*, Gr. *ἀγρός*, Skr. *ājras*, Germ. *Acker*, etc.; Lat. *avis*, Skt. *vis*; Lat. *agō*, Skt. *ājati*, Arm. *acem*, and Lat. *aqua*, Goth. *ahwa* (pp. 53, 71, § 70a). Nobody can challenge these etymologies (except perhaps the first one); but what is gained here by admitting laryngeals?

¹¹ No wonder that with the help of "laryngeals" Möller, Cuny, and Pedersen reconstructed "Proto-Indo-European-Semitic" (cf. Sturtevant, pp. 16 ff.). I think today nobody, except perhaps the authors, considers such an attempt seriously.

¹² I had written the present review when I happened to read Kent's review of the same work in *Language*, XIX (1943), 166, who on this point expresses exactly the same idea: "But the new broom sweeps clean, and is always in danger of sweeping out too much. The flexibility of the operations with the laryngeals is so great, that they may become a virtual panacea for all linguistic ills and troubles; cf. the lucubrations of Juret in *Formation des Noms et des Verbes en Latin et en Grec* (1937 [...]), who by their use can to his own satisfaction establish virtually any existing form as a direct inheritance from the pre-speech." This is, it seems to me, a very remarkable coincidence.

Lat. *nouāre*, *nouātus*, etc.). Cf. also Petersen, *AJP*, LIII (1932), 199. Sturtevant ignores the whole of it. See also, for the words in question, Petersen, *Language*, VII (1931), 118 ff.

⁹ If Hitt. *pahhur* is to be read *paur*, as it seems to me, then we have a remarkable confirmation of the "pre-laryngeal" comparative method, since exactly such a form was reconstructed as long ago as 1891 by K. F. Johansson, *Beiträge*, pp. 28 ff.; cf. also Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gramm.* (1896), p. 210, and Feist, *Vgl. Wb. der got. Spr.*, p. 158. On the *-hh-*, see Petersen, *JAOS*, LIX (1939), 183 ff.

(pp. 77 f.); they lengthen the preceding vowel ($i>\bar{i}$, $u>\bar{u}$, $y>\bar{y}$, etc. [pp. 69 ff.]) and sometimes also give it a different color (\bar{e} , \bar{o} , \bar{a} [pp. 66 ff.]); they unite with υ to give \bar{e} (p. 71); they double initial ν , λ in Greek ($\rho\theta\iota \nu\acute{\nu}\epsilon\phi\omicron\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha \lambda\lambda\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\eta}\nu$ [pp. 77 f.]); they preserve ι , υ between vowels in Greek (pp. 79 f.); they produce the "Verschärfung" in Germanic; they double the σ in Greek aorists ($\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$, $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon$ [p. 83]); they combine with preceding voiceless stops to form voiceless aspirates (pp. 83 ff.), but also with Skt. g to form h (Skt. $ahám$ = Gr. $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ [p. 86]); they voice a following s (p. 87) and a preceding p (*ibid.*); they explain the difference between the initial sounds of $\zeta\upsilon\gamma\acute{o}\nu$ and $\delta\varsigma$ (p. 78); they explain the dissyllabic aa of Ved. $ya\acute{a}nti$, $pa\acute{a}nti$ (p. 73); and something has probably escaped me. I will not discuss the phonetic or phonemic possibility of the existence of such sounds, although this rather important question does not seem clear to me. But I will say that, for such remote prehistoric periods as those with which we are dealing here when we discuss "Indo-Hittite"—hundreds, nay, thousands of years before any written document—one condition seems absolutely necessary: simplicity. It is an axiom of logic that applies also in linguistics, just as in physics or chemistry or any other science, that that theory will be the most acceptable which will present itself as the simplest and which will solve our problems with the minimum of hypothetical assumptions. The latter is surely not the case with the laryngeal theory.¹² Because this unique Hittite h —in a language whose phonetics are still so obscure and whose spelling is so variable—has not yet found a sure correspondent in the other Indo-European languages, this "Indo-Hittite" proto-language is loaded with four new sounds, phonetically mysterious, completely unknown in every other Indo-European tongue, endowed with the most extraordinary capacities, which, com-

binning with each other and with other sounds, produce no less than 55 phonemes in "Proto-Indo-European" (p. 90). Of these, nineteen at least (hy , hw , hr , hn , hm , \bar{b} , \bar{e} , \bar{k} , \bar{h} , \bar{g} , \bar{gh} , k^wh , g^wh , \bar{f} , \bar{l} , \bar{y} , \bar{y} , \bar{y} , \bar{y}) are found in no "Indo-European" language whatever, or in Hittite.¹³ The price which we pay in "granted assumptions" for the services of this theory is enormous.

Should I be asked whether I consider myself capable of refuting the laryngeal theory, I should certainly say, "No"; nobody can do that. Practically anything is "possible" in Indo-European four or five or six thousand years B.C. Nothing can be definitely proved or disproved. The question is whether or not a sufficient quantity of unassailable material can be brought into the field to furnish a tolerably probable basis for discussion. The *onus probandi*, in such cases, rests entirely upon the author who presents the new theory, not upon the critic.

Nor should I consider it a valid objection that I cannot myself offer a better solution, or a solution of any kind, for a few of the problems which the laryngeal theory claims to solve. We are by no means bound to accept any explanation whatever for a given problem for want of a better; if the solution offered is not sufficiently proved, we all have the right, nay, the duty, to reject it and leave the problem open.

Many questions are solved by the laryngeal theory, of course; I would say almost all. Practically, there is little left to do in the field of Indo-European phonology. And that is precisely what makes me feel so uneasy about it: these laryngeals are so changeable, so smooth, they comply so readily with any service which

¹² I may remark, by the way, that this phonemic system of Proto-Indo-European, as well as the Indo-Hittite and the laryngeal theories, is in complete contradiction to the results of linguistic geography; but I hope to elaborate this point on another occasion. See for the present my notes in *IF*, LII (1934), 221 ff., and *LV* (1937), 131 ff., and my articles in *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, XVIII (1939), 381 ff., and in *Archiv orientální*, XI (1939), 84-90.

¹³ The general tendency—and a very sound one—in Indo-European reconstruction these last years has been to reduce to a minimum the number of reconstructed phonemes, particularly eliminating those that are found in no attested language. We have abandoned progressively the "Spirant" j (cf. Sommer, *Griech. Lautstudien*, pp. 88 f.), Brugmann's \bar{d} and \bar{d} , the third velar series, $\bar{\beta}$ and $\bar{\beta}h$, \bar{d} and $\bar{d}h$; even the existence of the three (nonlaryngeal!) \bar{s} (\bar{s} , \bar{s} , \bar{s}) has been challenged. The progress has consisted in explaining more and more the "Irregularities" of each independent language within the language itself, without piling everything onto Indo-European. Sturtevant's method is exactly the opposite.

is asked of them. However, several problems which, according to Sturtevant, are solved by the laryngeal theory had been solved long ago, in a quite satisfactory, although unimaginative, way. I will recall here that the rough breathing of ἔννεμι, ἔσρια, ἔσπερος (p. 77) has been explained by Sommer, *Griech. Lautstudien*, pp. 114 ff. (particularly p. 122, with good theoretical remarks on p. 88);¹⁴ Vedic *paṇti*, *yaṇti* (p. 73) make no difficulty whatever and need no laryngeals, according to my theory of quantities, expounded in *Della intonazione sillabica indoeuropea* ("Mem. R. Accad. dei Lincei," ser. 6, Vol. III, Fasc. 3 [1930]), pp. 215 ff.; the problem of Oscan *tū* (p. 86, n. 41) has been solved, in my opinion, by myself in *RIGI*, XIX (1935), 182 ff.; the reason for the *ι* of *σταῖν*, *δοῖν*, *θεῖν*, *γνοῖν* (p. 80) has been given independently in the same way by Pisani, *Grammatica dell'antico indiano*, Fasc. II, § 492, and by myself in *RIGI*, XVII (1933), 100 ff.;¹⁵ the Greek aspirated perfect (p. 84) has found a brilliant and thorough interpretation in Kent's article in *Language*, XVII (1941), 189 ff. By the way, these solutions are not even mentioned by Sturtevant (with the exception of the last one), nor are the works of Hirt, which explained in a very satisfactory way *i*, *u*, *ī*, *ī*, *ū*, *ū*, *ī*, *ū*, *ī*, *ū*, *o*, and other phonemes.

A small, but ominous and characteristic, symptom of the "laryngeal" method is the following. Kurylowicz originally had posited the existence of three different "laryngeals" (in Sturtevant's terminology), no small number in my opinion. But, even so, everything was not solved. According to his rules, every Indo-European *a* should have lost a preceding laryngeal, which was preserved as *h* in Hittite; Gr. ἀργός = Hitt. *harkis*. However,

several Hittite words which ought to have presented the *h* did not obey the orders; they had none: Hitt. *appa* = Gr. ἀπός; *awan* = Lat. *au-*, and several others. He then decided (cf. *Études indo-européennes*, p. 75) that a fourth "laryngeal" (always in Sturtevant's terminology) was necessary, which presented the peculiarity that it disappeared in that given position. Gr. ἀργός (Hitt. *harkis*) had once an initial "second laryngeal," but ἀπό (Hitt. *appa*) had the "fourth laryngeal" (this idea is accepted by Sturtevant [pp. 40, 45], although with a different numeration of the second laryngeal).¹⁶ I cannot get rid of the feeling that this new laryngeal was invented just *pour le besoin de la cause* and that there is always a laryngeal ready when needed to explain anything. If three laryngeals are not sufficient to do the work, why not four? Why not five, six, seven?

Sturtevant's book is written in a dogmatic, deductive fashion. No attempt is made to show how the author arrived at the laryngeal theory, why it is necessary, what its advantages are, what the faults of the old Indo-European system were, why it did not work, how the new one compares with it, what the problems are, how they are solved, or anything of the kind. After a short history of the previous contributions (pp. 15-20), a bibliography (pp. 20-22), and a defense of Indo-Hittite (pp. 23-29), comes the description of the "Phonemic System of Indo-Hittite" (pp. 31-34), its vowels, consonants, "laryngeals," exactly as if it were a concrete system of a living language, familiar to the readers. No attempt is made to justify the assumptions. The next chapter (iii, pp. 35-59) contains the "Evidence for the Laryngeals"; chapter iv (pp. 60-65) explains how the laryngeals developed in Hittite; chapter v (pp. 66-89) how they developed in Indo-European. The closing chapter (vi, pp. 90-91) simply gives the result of all these developments, the phonemic system of Proto-Indo-European—not of "Indo-European," mark well! We are still hundreds and perhaps thousands of years before "Indo-European" as it is usually conceived (and which has, e.g., no *hy*, *hw*, *hr*, etc.). The

¹⁴ "Hat man nun ein Recht, allein auf Grund der Tatsache, dass im Griechischen bei einer Reihe von Fällen sich eine unregelmässige Entwicklung von *ε* zu *ι* zeigt, der Ursprache einen besonderen Laut aufzunötigen? Im Prinzip lässt sich das nicht abstreiten, wenn man sich auch nur in der äussersten Not (!) dazu entschlieszen wird."

¹⁵ Pisani in the following fascicule of the same journal (p. 212) claimed for himself priority for this explanation. I found such a remark quite strange, since Pisani himself in his *Grammatica* had taken over the whole doctrine of the *morae*, of which this is only a small corollary, from my work *Dell'intonazione sillabica indoeuropea*, without ever citing me.

¹⁶ However, even so, some cases do not fit: cf. pp. 52 f., 64 f.

whole book proceeds exclusively from Indo-Hittite to Proto-Indo-European. We start from Indo-Hittite as from something real; it is the basis for all our reasonings and deductions, not the goal we have to reach or an entity whose existence has to be laboriously demonstrated.

There are many other things to be said, but space is limited. What has been said, however, should be sufficient to indicate some of the reasons why I cannot accept Sturtevant's laryngeal theory, not even as a "working" hypothesis.¹⁷

Princeton University

G. BONFANTE

Thucydides. By JOHN H. FINLEY, JR. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942. Pp. vi+344. \$3.50.

In this volume Professor Finley resumes the interesting and instructive discussion of Thucydides already begun in his well-known series of contributions to *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Broadly speaking, his thesis is that the *History*, as we have it, is "not an agglomeration of passages written at widely different times and imperfectly blended together by reason of the author's premature death" but a substantial unity, "composed primarily at one time with the help of earlier notes and so revealing a set of consistent and

related ideas, organically developed from one end . . . to the other"; and, further, that, "although the author doubtless spent much time in his exile pondering and developing it, yet the climate in which the plan was born was essentially the innovating, analytical, realistic climate revealed, e.g., in Euripides' early plays." As Mr. Finley puts it (p. 273): "His mind was formed on the characteristic problems of that world, and his way of thought on its way of thought."

With this as his point of departure, Professor Finley now proceeds to examine the intellectual and spiritual atmosphere of the period covered by the *History*—a period which, as he remarks, the historian relived with such intensity. This he depicts as a time when the "realistic" thinking of the Sophists made its first and deepest impression on Athens; and he attributes to the impact of Sophism an all-pervasive change in outlook, best described perhaps as the victory of conceptual over symbolic or poetic modes of thought (p. 258). In this connection Mr. Finley has much of interest and value to say, especially with regard to the so-called antithetic style of discourse in relation to the contemporary mind. Sophistic influence, as he sees it, operated in two ways. In the first place, it provided a fresh impulse to scientific investigation and, therewith, to the "search for causes" in terms of which to understand characters and events. Secondly, it invented in rhetoric a vehicle for "logical" expression, i.e., for identifying and defining the concepts which, according to the findings of contemporary reason, constitute the pattern of things. Both these influences, which are to be discerned in the dramas of Sophocles and Euripides, as well as in the earliest extant samples of Athenian prose literature, are also, as Mr. Finley argues, fully illustrated in the work of the historian.

It may be questioned, however, whether these influences, important as they are, suffice to account for the thought of Thucydides, as this is revealed in the plan and method of the *History*. "One of the readiest and most fruitful ways of understanding the Sophists," says Mr. Finley, "is to realize that they merely applied to human behaviour the principles of mechanistic causation which the

¹⁷ Just as minor details, I may remark that on p. 23, n. 14, Sturtevant might have cited my note on the linguistic position of Hittite, published in *IF*, LV (1937), 131 ff.; that on pp. 26 f., § 18b (-m-/-w- and -l-/-) he ought to have discussed the criticism of Lohmann, *IF*, LIV (1936), 292; Gr. *re-* (not *re-*) in *νήρετος*, *νήλητ*, *νόνημος*, *νήμετος*, etc. (p. 57, § 55a) is admitted by Walde-Pokorny, II, 319, and supported, I think, by Slav. *ne-*, which is the regular Slavic negative prefix; p. 88, n. 48: there is no "abundant evidence of confusion between the two tenses [*sic*] perfect and aorist" from IE. times." I believe, and the barrier between Gr. *θηκα*, etc. and the *k*-perfect remains very difficult to bridge.

The "laryngeal" theory has been rejected by the following: A. Meillet, *BSL*, XXXV (1935), 29; M. Bartoll, *Archivio glottologico italiano*, XXIX (1937), 68 f.; W. Petersen, *Language*, IX (1933), 34; *AJP*, LIII (1932), 198 f.; *JAOS*, LIX (1939), 175-99; C. D. Buck, *Comparative Grammar*, Intro. to the second printing (1937); C. Marstrand, *Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap*, III (1929), 290-95; A. Berriedale Keith, *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XIV (1938), 202 f., 210, 212, and 215. Cf. also Bonfante, *Emerita*, IV (1936), 161; V (1937), 167 f.; *Classical Weekly*, XXXV (1942), 151.

Ionian physicists had applied to the Cosmos" (p. 42). The result, as he points out, is to produce the kind of reasoning on "materialistic" and "observational" lines evident, e.g., in the *Old Oligarch* and in Euripides' *Medea*. It is, he concludes, because Thucydides was so deeply affected by this new sense of man as the creature of natural forces (p. 57)—because, in fact, he had so thoroughly learned to reason along the same lines—that he imagined himself to possess "an absolutely new and absolutely reliable means of appraising the forces at work in his own day" (p. 48).

To propose such a thesis is, in the opinion of the present reviewer, to overlook an element of decisive importance in the mentality of Thucydides. For, whatever may be thought of the historian, he is assuredly no fatalist, at least in any crudely mechanistic and sensationalistic sense. To suppose that he is, is to obscure the significance of much that is distinctive in his thinking, particularly his sense of the relationship between stimulus and response, as this emerges, e.g., in what he has to say of the plague, considered as a physical fact, and of its psychological repercussions, the *ἀνομία* it serves to provoke in Athens, or, more generally, between the *ἔργα* and the *λόγοι*, the concrete situations which develop throughout the war, and the reasoned utterances to which they give rise. It is to miss the point that the relationship in question is, as the historian sees it, dialectical. To neglect this fact is to misconceive the concept of human nature (*τὸ ἀνθρώπινον*) upon which he makes his account of developments turn.

From this point of view we cannot but think that Mr. Finley has done something less than justice to the influence of early Hippocratic doctrine on the mind of the historian. There is much more to this than a question of terminology, as Mr. Finley appears to suggest (pp. 68-69). What it involves is nothing less than an attempt to discover a *via media* between earlier theories of historical causation, based on religious and philosophical principles, and the rank mechanistic or sensationalistic materialism to be found, e.g., in the *Old Oligarch* or in the *Helen* of Gorgias—in other words, to develop a position in the light of which man, while denied all capacity to

transcend the world of nature or the material world, might still be regarded as in some sense a genuine agent, the "maker" of his own history.

To see Thucydides in this context is, we feel, essential to an adequate appreciation of his work and of the claim that it would live as a "possession forever." Like most of his "advanced" contemporaries—the Sophists of the Periclean age—the historian was strictly and consistently *ἄθεος*; as such, he rejected *in toto* the element of myth which had so far dominated the writing of history. But, unlike the majority, he refused to throw the old gods overboard only to deify "fate" or "chance." Accordingly, he discovered the *hormé*—dynamic or principle of motion in human history—not in any general hypothetical principle but in history itself, i.e., in the relationship between the aspirations and ideals of men, on the one hand, and, on the other, the material circumstances upon which their satisfaction depends.

The question of Thucydides is thus, ultimately, a question of logic; it is to grasp the true character of Thucydidean materialism as a principle of understanding and as an instrument of historical analysis. Had Mr. Finley been more fully alive to this fact, he would have been in a better position to deal with certain of the characteristic problems of interpretation in this notoriously difficult author; the meaning of that wholly novel scale of values which first emerges in the Archaeology and is thereafter applied throughout the *History* as a basis for judgment on characters and events. To accept that scale of values is to represent the development of civilization itself as a by-product, so to speak, in the secular struggle of men for domination and power. It is also to accept the moral of Thucydides' investigation, the truth which, in his eyes, makes it an enduring possession. This truth is summarized in the aphorism that war, by taking away from communities and individuals the easy provision of their daily needs and so confronting them with imperious necessities, proves to be a "harsh schoolmaster" (surely, not, as Mr. Finley puts it [p. 306], "a teacher of violence"), which tends to assimilate their tempers to their circum-

stances. It is in the light of this principle that the historian develops his account of the events which occurred during the grim twenty-seven years of conflict and of their effect in promoting the disintegration of those norms or conventions of civilized conduct (*τὰ νόμιμα*) to which, as a conservatively minded thinker, he so fondly clings, even though he can no longer accept the religious or poetic ideology which sustained them, e.g., in the mind of a man like Nicias.

The tragic significance of the catastrophe which had overtaken Hellas was, in a peculiar sense, the tragedy of Periclean Athens, the noblest product of the Greek enlightenment. What her collapse revealed was thus much more than merely the "paradox of democracy," viz., that it releases forces which operate both to create and to destroy (Finley, p. 306). It was, in fact, the precarious nature of those intellectual and spiritual values constructed with blood, sweat, and tears by the generations whose sacrifice and achievement are commemorated in the Funeral Speech. From this standpoint the tragedy of the city was, at the same time, that of the historian's own mind. It is this fact which gives such power and vitality to his work; even though he was not destined to come into his own until, significantly enough, as Mr. Finley points out, the time of the Roman revolution.

Mr. Finley has written a stimulating and provocative book. If we have dwelt at some length on what seems to us to be its weakness, this is not because we are blind to its decided merits but because of a conviction that this weakness seriously impairs what is otherwise a competent, well-balanced, and illuminating study.

C. N. COCHRANE

University College, Toronto

Three Greek Tragedies in Translation [PV, OT, Hipp.]. By DAVID GRENE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. Pp. 228. Trade ed., \$2.50; text ed., \$1.75.

An English acquaintance once said to me of a certain book on Greek tragedy: "It made me realize for the first time that these works

are *plays*; at my school they were taught as masses of Greek grammar." He was not noticeably aged: I suppose he left school about the opening of this century. Precisely! English drama had only then awakened, under the impact of Ibsen, from the torpor which had bound it since Sheridan. Then arrived a dramatic renaissance in England, and in America also a notable advance; above all, Mr. Shaw and Mr. O'Neill produced masterpieces which naturally aroused deep and widespread interest not only in "the stage" but also in drama as literature and in theories of drama. Sooner or later this would in any case have created a vogue for Greek tragedy; but the tendency was immensely accelerated by Shaw's friend, Gilbert Murray. Of his translations Mr. Grene (p. viii) writes in the slighting or even hostile tone which grows yearly more frequent; but he neglects the immense service that Murray did by presenting Greek plays to the world, not as "ancient tomes," "precursors," and the like, but as living art.

One result of this revival has been that universities and publishers have taken avidly to translations, books about the Greek playwrights, and courses of lectures to Greekless students. Plainly it is most important that this work should be in the hands of people equally familiar with ancient and modern drama, clear-headed and possessing a true perspective. Mr. Grene's book approaches the ideal—thoroughly sound in scholarship, stimulating without lack of the due austerity, crisply expert without ostentation, and altogether free from woolly verbiage. The translations are good though not showy: usefully close to the original without that grim gauntness, that *rigor mortis*, that rattling of dry Bohns which make the usual close versions so repellent. A few examples will be more illuminating than discussion.

PV 887-93

A wise man indeed he was that first in judgment weighed this word and gave it tongue: the best by far it is to marry in one's rank and station: let no one working with her hands aspire to marriage with those lifted high in pride because of wealth, or of ancestral glory.

OT 167-77

Our sorrows defy number;
 all the ship's timbers are rotten;
 taking of thought is no spear for the driving away
 of the plague.
 There are no growing children in this famous
 land;
 there are no women staunchly bearing the pangs
 of childbirth.
 You may see them one with another, like birds
 swift on the wing.
 quicker than fire unmastered,
 speeding away to the coast of the Western God.

Hipp. 525-34

Love distills desire upon the eyes,
 love brings bewitching grace into the heart
 of those he would destroy.
 I pray that love may never come to me
 with murderous intent,
 in rhythms measureless and wild.
 Not fire nor stars have stronger bolts
 than those of Aphrodite sent
 by the hand of Eros, Zeus' child.

I doubt if these passages could be better done—for their special purpose. They are well written, and they cannot mislead: that is, no one could reasonably use them in any way or for any purpose in or for which the original also could not be used. But, whenever you find a Greekless reader enthusiastic over some passage in other verse translations, it transpires in nine cases out of ten that what he relishes has been injected by the translator.

My admiration for the introductory and special essays has already been expressed in general terms; I shall now offer some remarks on details.

P. 1.—A masterly opening paragraph. "Othello with another kind of interpretation of a lighter sort becomes the plot of *The Country Wife*."

Pp. 5 f.—Extremely acute and illuminating remarks on the Chorus:

... It is scarcely possible to realize the extraordinary (and in some sense the events of a tragedy are always extraordinary) without an immediate comparison with the ordinary and average, either in character or in action. So sometimes, and particularly at crucial moments in tragedy when the tension is greatest, it is expedient to have the Chorus voice the most obvious and ordinary sentiments in the most obvious

and banal way. For by this means we cast out the imp of disbelief and denigration which lives somewhere in every spectator, asserting that the world is not what the dramatist says it is or that the tragedy is an unnecessary fuss about nothing. In such instances the Chorus is so ordinary, so matter of fact, and so dully imperceptive that, recognizing the disbelieving or uncomprehending part of ourselves, we reject it. So our rational and ordinary selves are drained away, as it were, leaving us in the condition of mild hypnosis needed by the dramatist to tell us what he has to tell us. It is very interesting to notice how Shakespeare uses some of his comic characters in just such a choric function in the great tragedies.

Pp. 6 f.—An admirable note on commonplace endings.

P. 8.—"The Greeks deliberately took the Chorus . . . and shaped it for the dramatic purpose," etc. It should have been added that Euripides often felt the Chorus as a grave drawback, not, indeed, to his poetry, but to his dramaturgy, e.g., in *Medea* and *Iph. Taur.*

P. 12.—"Euripides . . . wrote his commonplace details as naked and unadorned as a grocer ticketing his goods." Apart from the poor style of this—no respectable grocer undresses himself as a preliminary to dressing his window—the statement about Euripides, though largely true, happens to be sadly misleading here. For the play selected is precisely that in which he has chosen, for whatever reason, to write mostly in a style far more ornate than usual. Not only are there touches of the epic manner—*εἰθὺς* "Ἀργεῖος" (vs. 1197), *φόβος* for "panic" (vs. 1218), *φίλος* for "his own" (vs. 1238), *ἐκρυφθεν* (vs. 1247)—but the Sophoclean manner is frequently marked, especially in the Messenger's speech (see, e.g., vss. 1223-26); Hippolytus' exquisite address to Artemis (vss. 73-87), though not Sophoclean, is the reverse of naked and unadorned. That the denouement should be charged with "a certain stiff formality" (p. 163) astonishes me. What of Artemis' breathlessly beautiful consolation?

Pp. 12 f.—That "the conveyance of certain complex moods . . . is unknown in Greek tragedy" should not be so sweepingly asserted. For good and fundamental reasons it is, of course, rare, but Heracles (in *Herc. Fur.*) and Phaedra, at least, should not be forgotten.

Pp. 16f.—“The dramatists . . . stuck resolutely to the two or three best-known stories.” We get this impression from the few extant plays. Ancient educators did tend strongly to confine themselves thus in their selections of works for study, and a play about Troy therefore had far more chance of survival than a play about Bellerophon. That is why the probably excellent *Phaëthon* has vanished, while the *Hecuba*, which is (for Euripides) extremely poor, flourishes tolerably even now.

Pp. 26f.—An excellent note on the justice or injustice of fate’s working.

P. 34.—“No editor . . . has realized the irony of Prometheus’ treatment of” Oceanus. On verses 330 ff. Sikes and Willson write: “Editors generally take this as ironical; e.g., Paley.” Anything realized by Paley must be confessed extremely obvious. Has any reader failed to catch the spirit of this scene?

P. 78.—“The plague is a compelling force throughout the whole course of the action” in *OT*. Then why does Sophocles allow us to forget it, as, at any rate, one reader always does after the lyrics (vss. 464 ff.), in which the Chorus transfer their passionate concern from the plague to the identity of the unknown homicide?

Pp. 82 ff.—These remarks on “the importance of the accidental quality of the significant clues” in *OT* should be pondered. “The play, then, . . . becomes a picture of the complexity and chaos of life itself” (p. 85). But Mr. Grene goes too far. He himself adds to the words just quoted: “strangely overridden by a compelling direction of events.” A chaos that is overridden and directed cannot be considered a good chaos. “Nothing,” he writes, “is generated out of Oedipus’ quarrel either with Teiresias or with Creon.” On the contrary, it is the Teiresias scene that occasions the scene with Creon; this again causes Jocasta’s intervention, in the course of which Oedipus hears her stunning remark, vital to the action, about the three cross-roads (vss. 715 f.).

P. 163.—I regret that Mr. Grene has lent his countenance to the empty fuss about the *agon*, even producing once more that dingy red herring, “the primitive religious rite.” The *agon* is a mare’s-nest first discovered by

Zielinski (*Gliederung der altattischen Komödie*), the whole of whose discussion rests upon an astounding insensibility to the very nature of drama. An *agon* is an elaborate verbal contest between two leading characters; it follows that any play ever written may well have one, but well may not. There are *ἀγῶνες* in Greek tragedy, e.g., *Eumenides*, *Ajax*, *Hippolytus*; in others there is none, e.g., *Persae*, *Philoctetes*, *Ion*. Countless *ἀγῶνες* occur in non-Greek drama written by men entirely unexcited by the *ἐνιαντὸς δαίμων*: e.g., *Adelphoe*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *A Doll’s House*, *Man and Superman*.

Pp. 165 f.—Phaedra and her tragedy are vigorously proclaimed the center of the play, Hippolytus being only a foil to her. Here we come perilously close to mere debating points — “Resolved: that Phaedra is more important than Hippolytus.” Why not simply conclude that this drama, like the *Bacchae* and *Macbeth*, unlike *Agamemnon*, *Lear*, and so many more, has two main characters, who, if not precisely equal in significance, are yet on the same plane? I dwell on this because Mr. Grene’s insistence on “backing” Phaedra has led him woefully to underrate the complexity of Hippolytus’ character. Though assuredly I do not think Phaedra a foil to him, that judgment would be less untrue than the other. If Mr. Grene wishes to find a Euripidean “satire on the intellectuals of the fifth century,” let him seek it in *Orestes*.

As is usual and no doubt inevitable in reviews, most of these notes are adverse. But very few claim to be corrections; most refer to matters of opinion or to omissions. I heartily recommend this book to all students of drama.

GILBERT NORWOOD

University of Toronto

Yale Classical Studies, Vol. VIII. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. Pp. iv+178. \$2.00.

This volume offers six essays on widely differing topics.

In the first, by C. W. Mendell, entitled “Lucan’s Rivers,” the opening remarks raise an apprehension that we are to be subjected

to an uncritical eulogy; but this apprehension proves groundless, as the author proceeds to study in considerable detail the use made by Lucan of rivers as a *purpureus pannus*. He links up the relatively large number of rivers mentioned in the *Pharsalia* with the topics advised by Horace, as indicating a new trend in epic writing, a special phase of rhetorical embellishment. The stress laid on the influence of lyric poetry is perhaps open to question; one might make out a case for the converse. But there is point in the citations from Velleius Paterculus, Curtius Rufus, and perhaps Pliny the Younger, as showing that historians were likely to favor the decorative use of rivers in digressions, and from Seneca the Elder, as indicating the adoption of this device among rhetoricians. In addition to the ordinary poetical handling of rivers, Mendell emphasizes two special uses in Lucan: first, in three digressions on Thessalian magic, Alexander, and that source of wonder to ancient northerners, the actions of the Nile; and, second, in four major digressions, the two catalogues of the opposing forces and the two geographical essays on Italy and Thessaly. This last group is then treated in some detail, with suggestions as to the influence of a number of authors and of the geographical manuals. The general conclusion is that Lucan "most completely lived up to Horace's description of the declamatory epic."

The second essay, entitled "M. Tullius Cratippus, Priest of Rome," is "the central portion of a study left among the papers of Professor O'Brien-Moore." In spite of an indication here and there¹ that the editors have perhaps been overcareful to leave these notes in their pristine form, it is a valuable, richly documented, closely reasoned composition of variegated evidence, illuminating a funeral inscription set up by a certain "Tullia M. f.," who appears to have been the daughter, or more likely the grand-daughter, of the Peripatetic philosopher Cratippus. This Greek teacher, a friend of several eminent Romans, on being naturalized by Julius Caesar, took the name M. Tullius Cratippus in honor of his particular intimacy with

¹ E.g., the partial quotation from Cicero (p. 42), which makes him appear to use a Silver Age construction with *impetrare*.

the great orator, who had obtained the boon for him. His son, or grandson, "M. Tullius M. f. Cor. Cratippus, Sacerdos Romae et Salutis," commemorated on the stone, would appear to have held his priesthood in the thirties or the twenties of the first century B.C. The discussion of these matters is followed by an excursus on the constitutional and historical aspects of Roman naturalization.

In "Hyspaosines of Charax," A. R. Belinger utilizes the discovery at Dura of two bronze coins issued by this none too well known monarch of a small territory to gather up information furnished by coins (some of which are reproduced photographically) and by literary sources and, admittedly, by a modicum of assumption to reconstitute the history of Charax and its complicated international relations from the late second century B.C. until the days of Trajan.

There follows the publication by Harry M. Hubbell of an interesting little board from Egypt, dated in the sixth century A.D., written in a neat and rather attractive Greek script but with atrocious spelling, containing a brief exhortation to the "sons of light," a prayer, and the text of Ps. 133, followed by the last eight verses of Ps. 118, both interspersed with the "acclamation" *δόξα σοι, φιλάνθρωπε*. (Incidentally, one wonders whether this cry is not to be assumed as lost at the ends of lines 8, 9, and 10, where the excellent photographic reproduction seems to provide room, and the other passages an analogy.) Spellings like *τωξασν* for *δόξα σοι* and *ευριστημφοτος* for *ἐγείρεσθε, υἱοὶ φωτός*, the editor suggests, indicate the influence of Coptic. The document is judged to be "an early *Μεσονύκτιον*, probably from an Egyptian monastery," intended for a Christian service.

The archeological discoveries at Dura form the starting-point for another informative historical essay, by R. O. Fink, "*Victoria Parthica* and Kindred *Victoriae*." The author points out the differences between the cult of *Victoria Parthica*, *Victoria Germanica*, etc., and (1) annual *feriae* celebrated on the anniversary of important victories in the civil wars, embracing the worship of *Victoria* along with that of other deities; (2) the cults of personal *Victoriae* such as those of Sulla and

Julius Caesar, which represented divine agencies that provided or insured victory; (3) *Victoria Augusti*, whose worship was maintained by emperors long after the death of Augustus, as the personification of the emperor's divine power; and (4) the less easily defined *ludi* named as connected with campaigns against foreign nations. The author concludes that *Victoria Parthica* or other *Victoriae* related to specific countries were "personifications of military successes," are traceable from the time of Claudius for two or more centuries, and, though usually related to important victories, in two instances were rather a sham—a bit of propaganda to enhance the emperor's prestige. In unofficial circles they were somewhat confused with *Victoria Augusti*, and even the later emperors were inclined to treat the latter as the "personification of individual military successes."

The final paper is by Eugene G. O'Neill, Jr., on "The Localization of Metrical Word-Types in the Greek Hexameter," a statistical classification in regard to position in the line of nearly fifty thousand words found in a little over seven thousand hexameters chosen from Homer, Hesiod, Aratus, Callimachus, Apollonius, and Theocritus. The author has to put prosodical irregularities, as he makes clear, in a sort of straitjacket; but normally he gets away from a merely mechanical view of his problems, realizing, for instance, that enclitics, proclitics, and particles like *γάρ* or *μήν* were neither fish nor flesh but something between parts of words and independent units. Tables are given to show in what part of the line words of any particular metrical value occur. Words longer than \cup , $\cup\cup$, or $\cup\cup\cup$ tend to be placed in certain parts of the line, and the predilections shown by Homer seem to persist for centuries. An extreme example is that of words of the type $\cup\cup\cup\cup$, which show a very marked penchant for beginning after the feminine caesura in the third foot; another is the type $\cup\cup\cup\cup$, which are hardly found except at the end of the line. On the other hand, some word types tend to avoid certain placements; for instance, words of the types $\cup\cup\cup$, $\cup\cup\cup\cup$, $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$, $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$, $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$ very rarely end in the fourth foot; obviously, in other terms, any word

which would produce a feminine caesura in the fourth foot was pretty well put somewhere else. The tables and the accompanying discussion provide much other similar interesting material worth studying by all who are interested in the Greek hexameter and, in particular perhaps, by those who would essay composition in this meter. In a supplement there is given a summary of earlier studies bearing on the topic. One might question the validity of including the feminine caesura in the third foot as part of "Varro's Law" or the dismissal of Wernicke's "law" on what seem irrelevant grounds; but these are trifling matters in a readable and informative digest of this aspect of metrical research. The author intimates further studies both in a chronological extension of the present essay and in the metrics of word-grouping, or what one might call "caesural series."

O. J. TODD

University of British Columbia

The Complete Roman Drama. Edited by GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH. 2 vols. New York: Random House, 1942. Pp. xlvii+905; 971.

These are welcome companion volumes to the Oates and O'Neill, *Complete Greek Drama*. That such books make their appearance now is probably a sign of the unclassical times in which readers, unwilling or unable to find good translations for themselves, must have them handed to them in convenient form. But, notwithstanding the circumstances which cause their appearance, they are extremely welcome, and Random House is to be congratulated. With Plautus, Terence, and Seneca appears the late and little-known *Querolus*, now for the first time published in English.

A fine Introduction deals with dramatic beginnings and fragmentary authors. Then follows an excellent essay on the nature of Roman comedy and the qualities of Plautus and Terence. This will be invaluable to the nonprofessional reader, innocent of the manifold problems involved. Professor Duckworth handles the disputed points so expertly that a clear picture is given the lay reader, but without obtruding *Wissenschaft* and without any one prejudiced point of view's being dog-

matically oversimplified—a common fault of popular introductions. All phases of ancient comedy and its relation to the Greek forbears are treated with an ease that reveals the editor's familiarity with the problems and his good judgment in dealing with them; the reader will have a comfortable confidence in the picture given him in spite of admittedly unsolved details. The introduction to Seneca is a valiant effort to justify his position as a tragic poet; it will receive praise or condemnation according to one's own convictions. But no one will quarrel with the even greater space devoted to Seneca's *Fortleben*. Brief introductions to each play deal aptly with their qualities and their influence in later literature. A glossary of proper names enables footnotes to be happily reduced to a minimum in explaining references otherwise unintelligible to the lay reader.

The main problem facing editors of collected translations and that which engages the major interest of reviewers is the selection of the renderings. For Terence and Seneca there was some, though not wide, choice. Professor Duckworth has used the best in the Miller and the Harris Seneca and in the anonymous 1900 Terence, and B. H. Clark's *Phormio*. With Plautus the problem was reversed; only seven usable translations were available. For the others five were obtained from contemporary scholars and nine (including the *Querolus*) written by the editor. Since these now appear for the first time, the reviewer must concern himself with them. As all classicists know, translation is at best a poor thing, and Plautus is next to impossible. In translating for the lay public, then, there are only two possible policies. One is to render the Latin so as to make it clear what Plautus said and how he said it; but this accuracy exacts a heavy toll from the vigorous and spirited language of the original which too often cannot be represented both accurately and entertainingly in twentieth-century English. The other is to throw Latin grammar and idiom figuratively to the winds, employing modern phraseology and allusions in their place (as Plautus himself did); the resulting text is still live, if not "literal," two thousand years later. It may run the risk of dating a little sooner than the

other, but it will certainly be more attractive to the nonclassical reader. Both choices, and degrees between them, have been made by the translators in these volumes. The first type will be seen at its best in the editor's nine plays, in C. T. Murphy's three, and in C. K. Chase's *Rudens*. The second type appears in E. C. Weist and R. W. Hyde's magnificent version of the *Menaechni* (by far the best translation in the whole collection), in J. R. Workman's *Stichus*, and, among the older translations, in E. L. Basset and L. W. Jarcho's *Mostellaria*. Allison's and Sugden's verse renderings sometimes suffer from the stiff monotony which readers today often find in the verse form, but are otherwise most attractive.

For all these translations, the Introduction, and the finely printed volumes we may be very thankful to Random House, to the editor's contributors, and, above all, to Professor Duckworth, who has acquitted himself so well in this tremendous, and in some ways thankless, undertaking. These books should render great service to those who cannot take their drama in the original and may also, we hope, bring it to some who know it not.

JOHN N. HOUGH

Ohio State University

Those Ancient Dramas Called Tragedies. By WILLIAM KELLY PRENTICE. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1942. Pp. 194 + 2 illus. \$2.50.

This book contains three essays: "The Origin of 'Tragedy,'" "The Trilogy Called the Oresteia," "The Oedipus-Legend"; and accounts of eleven plays: *PV*, *Ag.*, *Cho.*, *Eum.*, *Ant.*, *OT*, *Phil.*, *Alc.*, *Med.*, *Iph.*, *Taur.*, *Bacch.* It is admirably produced, and I have noticed but one misprint—*Alcetes* in the first line of page 131; Professor Gilbert Murray is not a knight (p. 150).

To describe the book both accurately and quite courteously seems impossible. Taking it as a whole, one is forced to confess that one cannot understand why it was published. Was it originally a series of talks addressed to school pupils? What are we to make of such artless remarks as these? Of Creon in *Antigone*

we read: "It is a pity that his change of mind was made too late" (p. 84). "The story of the riddle of the sphinx was invented in the sixth century. Of course that is a very long while ago how" (p. 96). "What an innumerable host of nymphs and mortal maidens Zeus took unto himself . . . ! Zeus should have known better. . . ." The volume is mostly résumés of the eleven tragedies—accounts to be found, as everyone knows, in numberless earlier books; the discussions thereto appended are nearly always obvious and inadequate.

Certain inaccuracies are to be noted. "Finally, the choruses were omitted altogether" (p. 5). There is no evidence that tragedies were at any date acted without choruses: mimes were a different kind of drama. "These plays [i.e., of New Comedy] seem uniformly to have lacked any moments of high emotional tension or appeals to reflection" (p. 9). The new fragments of Menander utterly refute this: the arbitration scene in the *Eptrepontes* is only one example. On page 10 the figures for the orchestra diameter are based on a misunderstanding (cf. Flickinger, *The Greek Theatre and Its Drama*, 3d ed. pp. 342 f.). "Might and Force drag in the struggling Prometheus" (p. 19). A lay figure must have been used for the terrible treatment described by Aeschylus; and how could a lay figure struggle? It seems impossible to suppose that anything or anybody was (dramatically) "dragged in." The figure must have been set up before the play began: the actor presenting Prometheus came in behind the declivity at the orchestra's further edge. The paragraph on page 25 is lamentable: we know a good deal about the two plays that accompanied PV, and they are highly important to our understanding thereof. For instance, certain peculiarities or faults in Prometheus become intelligible only when we have the whole trilogy in focus. The allusion (p. 68) to Heracles is vague and misleading: no fragment known to me shows that he called "the legends of the house of Atreus" false. It is untrue (*ibid.*) that Aeschylus "did not deny any part of the legends in which most people of his time believed." His account (*Eum.* 1 ff.) of the deities who successively presided over Pytho alters tradition drastically. On page

105 Tiresias' prophecy is misreported, horrible explicitness being substituted for the mysterious language actually used. On page 178, "this would be assuming more dignity than the god" mistranslates *Bacch.* 192.

But in the middle of the book we receive a sudden and most welcome surprise: pages 83–85 (containing a discussion of difficulties in the plot of *Antigone*) easily outweigh all the rest put together. Professor Prentice does great service by insisting (p. 85) that "this play is primarily about Creon and his calamity." As for the question "Why did Creon bury Polyneices before he went to release Antigone?" Jebb's answer, based on avoidance of anticlimax, is satisfactorily refuted (p. 84). "If Creon, even after the death of Antigone and Haemon, had still gone on, stoically and doggedly, to bury the body of Polyneices, would not that have been very impressive indeed?" Again, Antigone's repetition of the rite is well explained (p. 83), even though the paragraph trails off into obscurity. Three explanations are offered, all correct: it gives an opening for the guard's interview; it proves "that Antigone was really a fanatic"; and "she was afraid that the wind had somehow nullified the rite." There are a few other good points, among which I, at least, place the discussion (pp. 182–86) of the miracles in the *Bacchae*: here you may read, as scarcely anywhere else, a fair statement of what happens, and what does not happen, to the palace. On page 70 occurs an excellent remark about men as agents of God and the reason why the curse on the house of Atreus ended with Orestes. Here is a wise description of Sophocles' method (p. 43): "He took the story as he found it, because it was most suitable for a tragic drama, and he presented it effectively, without reflection on its implications." This remark is made à propos of *OT* but should be borne in mind whatever play we study. Nevertheless, it should be applied warily to *Philoctetes*: Professor Prentice is probably right in thus explaining the epiphany of Heracles (p. 127); but clearly the work as a whole is a "problem play," for Sophocles invented the situation of Neoptolemus.

GILBERT NORWOOD

University of Toronto

The Social Basis of Roman Power in Asia Minor. By SIR WILLIAM M. RAMSAY. Prepared for the press by J. G. C. ANDERSON. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1941. Pp. xii+305.

The ambitious aim of this posthumous and unfinished work was to explain the Romanization of Asia Minor by means of epitaphs and other inconspicuous evidence. The results of the inquiry, summarized (oddly enough), on pages 48-50, are hardly new and striking. The idea that "the durability and the strength of the Empire lay in its power to take into itself and to utilize for its own purpose the ablest of provincials" (p. 49) has long been standard among the *laudes Romae*. It would be well to notice that in return the Romans expected the complete assimilation of ambitious provincials and did not tolerate "hyphenated" Romans—an attitude which explains some aspects of Greco-Roman relations under the Caesars.

To support his ideas the author reproduces about three hundred inscriptions (many of them *inedita*) from Anatolia, with commentaries which are more or less instructive but often capricious. We may note interesting observations about marriages with aunts in Anatolia (p. 30), the suggestion that Juven. i. 130 refers to C. Julius Quadratus (p. 46), remarks on the fictitious *origo* of soldiers (p. 94), a new restoration of the fragment *Altertümer von Hierapolis*, No. 353 (p. 59), etc. The author, however, has sometimes been led, by a natural eagerness to obtain as much information as possible, to discover in the texts the evidences he would like to find there. Thus he discovers (p. 299) a cryptic eulogy of the famous jurist Papinianus in a banal inscription from Tarsus (*BCH*, 1883, p. 325) or invites us (p. 158) to understand as "under a foreign consul" the date "under the consulate of Peregrinus" in the apocryphal *Acta* of St. Timothy—a compilation of the fifth century (cf. now H. Delehay, *Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler*, p. 79). Or we read that the name Apollonios suggests the sacerdotal quality of the person (p. 119). Elsewhere, the hypothesis takes the shape of a veritable novellette, which is not borne out by any evidence (see, e.g., p. 110 or p. 119).

On the other hand, as the author neglects

the literature of his subject, he often overlooks the real significance of the texts he quotes. The whole chapter about Comana (pp. 101-28) is antiquated because the author does not know the inscriptions published by G. de Jerphanion (*Mélang. Beyrouth*, 1911); the inscription reproduced on page 204 is to be corrected with reference to the text of *Suppl. epigr. graec.*, VI, 541; the statements given on page 23 have to be corrected according to L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes*, p. 262; the chapter about Dionysopolis (pp. 80-84) is obsolete after the publication in 1934 of L. Robert's *Villes d'Asie Mineure*; the tale the author builds up about a tombstone he publishes (p. 54, No. 36) is refuted beforehand by the inscription in *Mon. Asiae Minor. Ant.* I, 413. To explain the term "Augustalis" in some Anatolian inscriptions he quotes (p. 63) Lydus but fails to take into consideration the fact that this Byzantine author speaks of a service in the imperial court. For the "Augustales" in the provincial administration in the late Roman Empire, we may rather refer to some papyri from Syene. Another example: on some coins from Synnada we read the epithet *τροφεύς* given to a magistrate. The author translates "foster-father" (p. 262). But L. Robert has shown (*Rev. arch.*, 1934, i, 48), starting from the same coins, that the title designated a benefactor who supplied the city with corn, etc.

As the book has only a short index of place-names it is not easy to use.

E. BICKERMAN

New School for Social Research
New York

Initiation à l'étruscologie. By MARCEL RENARD.

Preface by A. GRENIER. Brussels: Office de publicité, Coll. Lebègue, 1941. Pp. 93+37 figs. on 14 pls.

This is the first modern French book on Etruscology. The author has already achieved renown by many articles on Etruscan and early Roman history and culture; now he presents an up-to-date handbook of Etruscology for college students and educated laymen. The handbook is excellently planned and well executed. Renard gives substantial information, which embodies all important

results of modern research; and he illustrates his account with a selection from Etruscan art which includes some of the most interesting recent discoveries, such as the fine fifth-century terra-cotta torso from Veii and the beautiful fourth-century quadriga from Tarquinii. Paper and cuts are of wartime quality, as one might expect; the miracle is that books dealing with such scholarly topics could be produced in Belgium in 1941. This publication is an eloquent testimony to the vitality of scholarship under most adverse conditions.

The recent essays on the Etruscans in English by D. Randall-MacIver, by G. M. A. Richter, and by the reviewer have been written by archeologists and concentrate on Etruscan archeology and art. Renard is at his best in the discussion of origins, history, society, and religion of the Etruscans (chaps. i-iv). We sense that he has carried out research of his own in these fields. He clearly indicates the opposing opinions on all essential issues, but never fails to state clearly with whom he sides and always shows the reasons for his preference. The chapter on art appears less original, as the author frequently repeats traditional judgments and shows no close acquaintance with the stylistic methods of research.

The greatest asset of Renard's book is its catholicity. He has considered his topic from the various aspects championed by the representatives of the different disciplines. Thus he mentions the results of the anthropological investigations when dealing with the question of origins (Sergi and Fischer, but not Coon, whose book was presumably not available in Belgium); thus he gives an intelligent survey of the social and political organization of the Etruscans and reports Ciaceri's interesting remark on the *nomen Etruscum* as indicative of the notion of common origin rather than of "nation" in the modern sense. He rightly mentions the Etruscan coinage in the discussion of Etruscan economy. The treatment of religion, too, for all its brevity, is comprehensive and sound, although the reviewer would hesitate to subscribe to the idea that the divine was perhaps originally conceived in a "manière assez vague comme un principe impersonnel et assexue. . ."; there is a strong probability that at least the Mediterranean

triad of a goddess, her consort, and her son (the last two possibly being one person) was a trait of the Etruscan religion even before the Etruscans settled in Italy.

Renard's book will be most useful in history courses or as background reading for a general course in classical archeology. Beyond that, it is an eminently readable essay, from which any student of antiquity and any person with classical interests can in a few hours' reading obtain a well-rounded and trustworthy picture of the Etruscan civilization.

GEORGE M. A. HANFMANN

Harvard University

Nouum Testamentum Graece secundum textum Westcott-Hortianum: Euangelium secundum Matthaeum cum apparatu critico nouo plenissimo, lectionibus codicum nuper repertorum additis, editionibus uersionum antiquarum et Patrum ecclesiasticorum denuo inuestigatis edidit. By S. C. E. LEGG, A.M. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. \$7.00.

This has gone far enough. In 1935, Mr. Legg published the Westcott and Hort text of the Gospel of Mark with a selected critical apparatus. This work was marred by numerous and serious faults.¹ Similar faults appear in the present volume. Since the text is an old one, the apparatus must justify the publication. This it cannot do. It is inadequate (1) in the selection of the material to be quoted, (2) in the consistency with which the selected material is cited, (3) in the accuracy of the citation, and (4) in the method of presenting the evidence.

On the first point it is sufficient to point out that the *textus receptus* is not cited, that two or three lectionaries are cited as individuals, that the Vulgate is cited even in the reading of single manuscripts. In the twenty-five verses of chapter 1, the citation "vg 1 MS" appears thirty-six times, and the citation of two, three, or four manuscripts runs the total up to fifty-five occurrences. In a limited apparatus more important evidence could be put in this space. (2) The inconsistencies are legion. In 1:23 the reading

¹ Cf. the review by Vogels in *Theologische Revue*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 819 (1935), cols. 305-12, and my review in this *Journal*, XXXIII, No. 1 (January, 1938), 112-15.

εγγαστρι is noted for MS 543, but the occurrence of the same reading in the same manuscript is unnoted in 1:18. In the genealogy in 1:1-16, minute variations in the proper names are noted, but not for ιεσσαί in 1:5. MS 33 is usually cited but is sometimes included with the indistinguished mass in the symbol "al." The unical Ω is frequently cited, but I noted three passages in chapter 1 and nine in chapter 16 in which its evidence is not given. Three times out of fifty-five the manuscripts of the Vulgate are named. In the citations from Irenaeus in chapter 1, the number of times a reading occurs is indicated only once, in verse 22. (3) Inaccuracies noted in chapter 1 include 1:1, failure to cite the omission of ιησου χριστου by k; 1:3, "esron g" should be "ezsrhon g" (pr. tant.) ezsrhom (sec.) in support of W and f.; 1:4 fails to cite nabassom bis k; 1:6 fails to cite 1241 on σολομωνα; 1:14 fails to cite W αχειν bis; 1:16 omits maria from the text of a g'q; 1:18 reads praevieniens for praemuniens in Irenaeus; 1:20 fails to cite W and Iren. on the transposition εφανη κατ οναρ; 1:20 reads ιωσηφ: om. Θ, should read αυτω λεγων ιωσηφ τω ιωσηφ λεγων Θ; 1:23 cites Iren. for καλεουσιν, which occurs in III. 9. 2 and 16. 2 but *vocabitur* is not noted in iv. 23. 1; 1:23 fails to cite εμμανουηλ D. (4) In method of presentation it is to be regretted that there is almost no grouping of witnesses under symbols; that all the versions are presented in a Latin translation; that the evidence for the reading of the text is sometimes presented, sometimes not; that there is no record of lacunae except in major cases and never in the apparatus itself; that patristic references are sometimes incomplete, e.g., 1:17, Clem. Alex. strom xxi. 147 (!)

The result of all this is that one can seldom tell what a specific witness reads in a particular verse, that one cannot depend upon the accuracy or fulness of the citation, and that at best one has but part of the relevant evidence. It is to be hoped that the Clarendon Press will abandon this project. The work is beautifully printed, but it is to be doubted that this will console the unfortunate student who pays \$7.00 for it.

ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL

University of Chicago

Hippocratic Medicine: Its Spirit and Method.

By WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. xv +149.

This little volume by the late Professor Heidel is not a philological work in the technical sense. It is addressed to physicians and excludes discussion of such particular problems as the origin of the Hippocratic Corpus, the influence of the various schools, or the personality and authorship of Hippocrates. The "spirit and method" of Hippocratic medicine, rather than its historical conditions or its detailed medical and surgical achievements, form the subject of the book.

The picture which Professor Heidel gives of the Hippocratic physician's approach to medical science and art can be briefly sketched as follows: The Hippocratics were medical practitioners and thought of medicine chiefly as an art. But, in method, pre-Aristotelian science and medicine were one, and the spirit in which the Hippocratics approached their art was "thoroughly scientific" (pp. 37 and 70). As scientists they were "essentially experimentalists and . . . keen to note and utilize the observations resulting from their practice" (p. 114). As physicians, they aimed at a comprehensive consideration of symptoms (pp. 128 f.) and a reasonable etiology (p. 125).

It is impossible here to fill in all the details of the picture or to discuss the many debatable opinions. For instance, one might take issue with Professor Heidel's contention that prognosis was "obviously" practiced "in the interest of the art itself" (p. 132) or that Plato represented Hippocrates as taking the view that "medicine is to be regarded as a special application of general science" (p. 13). One might also doubt whether Alcmaeon can serve "as an example of the ideals and methods of the medical profession in the generation just preceding that of Hippocrates" (p. 44). Since these and many other views are integral parts of Professor Heidel's general picture and are often stated rather than proved, all detailed criticism will finally challenge the correctness of the picture itself. In this reviewer's opinion the latter is not convincing; Professor Heidel stresses the similarities to the modern approach so as to leave the reader without a feeling for

the historical atmosphere in which the Hippocratic physicians lived and worked.

This lack of reality is not due to any lack of illustrative examples. The book throughout is amply documented by translations often from works hitherto not rendered into English. The mere presentation of so much valuable material makes this volume very welcome, even if Professor Heidel's general point of view cannot be accepted without reservations.

OWSEI TEMKIN

*Johns Hopkins University
Institute of the History of Medicine*

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: Fogg Museum and Gallatin Collections. By GEORGE H. CHASE and MARY ZELIA PEASE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942. Pp. 116; 42+32 pls.

The first American fascicule of the *Corpus*, published in 1926, comprised the Hoppin and Gallatin collections, with text written by their possessors. The Hoppin collection was bequeathed to the Fogg Museum; and in 1941, as stated on a slip pasted into the text of this fascicule, most of the Gallatin collection was acquired by the Metropolitan Museum. The present publication comprises a few unpublished pieces from the Hoppin collection and the other ancient vases in the Fogg Museum, with text by Dean Chase, and the vases added to the Gallatin collection since 1924, with text by Miss Pease. The Gallatin plates are numbered in continuation of the Gallatin series previously published, though the corresponding pages of text are numbered in continuation of the text for the Fogg collection; one more problem for those who cite the *Corpus*.

Most of the Gallatin vases were photographed some years ago, and the high lights are noticeable; but the pictures are generally good in both divisions of the fascicule. Additional views of ornament and other details would have been welcome. One Fogg plate is devoted to graffiti, which is well worth while. The main part of Miss Pease's text was written as a Ph.D. dissertation in 1932; as might be expected, it is somewhat more ambitious than Dean Chase's text; but both are concise, scholarly, and adequate. The attributions of

Attic vases are generally those given by Beazley. A Fogg kylix (Pl. 14), previously unpublished, is assigned without qualification to Hermonax, with a reference to his signed pelike in Vienna. Perhaps this attribution, by no means convincing, is based on the old, inaccurate illustration of the pelike.

There are not many pieces of great individual interest. A nice lekythos, previously assigned to the Berlin Painter, is illustrated for the first time (Fogg, Pl. 17); is not the costume of the Nike all one garment? Probably the most notable parts of the Fogg collection are the Italian sigillata (Pls. 30-34) and the Gallo-Roman pieces (Pls. 40-41); the writer's special authority in the former field is evident in the text, brief as it is. Attic black-figure and red-figure pieces occupy 27 of the 32 Gallatin plates, and many of them are quite good. Notable are four black-figure, white-ground lekythoi found in a single grave (Pls. 44-45), all assigned to the Sappho Painter, one with a sunrise scene of interest in several ways. There is also a kylix (Pl. 33, No. 14) imitated from Attic ware, with an inscription that looks as if it would mean something, but it does not, at least not in Greek.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

L'Influence des littératures antiques sur la littérature française moderne. By HENRI PEYRE. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941. Pp. 108.

This small book on a large subject is filled with suggestive remarks on the nature and vitality of the classics. The author's interest is by no means restricted to France, and there are many useful items of bibliography which may be unknown to classicists. In part it is a means of utilizing an earlier work,¹ but the general attitude toward the classics and the still unexplored areas which are indicated should stimulate further research. One of the most valuable effects is to reopen one's eyes to the "livingness" of the classics and to put the preoccupations of contemporary classical research into perspective. Since much of our scholarship is necessarily devoted to detailed

¹ *Bibliographie critique de l'Hellénisme en France de 1843 à 1870.* Yale University Press, 1932.

studies of classical authors and since classical influences are likely to be traced primarily in English literature, even a brief view of the impact of the classics on French literature is illuminating. M. Peyre devotes sections to the Renaissance, the seventeenth century, the eighteenth century, the Romanticists, the Parnassians, and contemporary influences. He prefaces the details by arguing that it is a great mistake to view the influence of the classics as always "une influence assagissante une leçon de modération ou d'adoration conventionnelle du passé" (p. 25). The lost, violent souls, no less than the timid, can on occasion find a vitalizing force in classical literature. Even the trained scholar may fail to communicate his own realization of the variety of spirit and historical environment which is included in the term "classical," and the easier task of distinguishing the enormous difference in the spirit of the seventeenth century and the early nineteenth century, for instance, may lead him back by way of the variation of classical influences on the literature of these periods to a sounder view of the differences and similarities in ancient authors. M. Peyre performs a valuable function for the reader in emphasizing the difference within the tradition along with the elements of homogeneity.

In a period in which it seems likely that at least one college generation of students of the classics will be completely lost and the problem of finding students equipped for the study of Greek and Latin in the original looms large, some encouragement may be derived from the instances of living interest which arose in France from translations. In the absence of a stable curriculum which automatically supplies students trained in the original languages, their interest must be aroused by secondhand methods, and the influence of translations both in England and in France has been far greater than might be supposed, as M. Peyre shows. Whatever one's feeling about the means of arousing interest, there is a real source of encouragement for scholars and lovers of the classics in M. Peyre's account of classical influence upon successive generations in France.

F. R. B. GODOLPHIN

Princeton University

Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs. By RICHMOND LATTIMORE. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1942. Pp. 354. Paper, \$3.00; cloth, \$3.50.

Mr. Lattimore's book is one of admirable completeness and simplicity; indeed, we have had few classical works in this century in which so great acumen and common sense are matched with an equal degree of learning. In several important respects the result reminds one more of the works of earlier eras, concerning the author of one of which it has been said, "He seems to have read everything published and unpublished which could explain or illustrate" his subject; "and his vast learning is carried lightly and imparted simply in terse notes of moderate compass."

The themes which Mr. Lattimore treats naturally concern only the attitude of the ancients toward death, for he is occupied with epitaphs alone; and it is safe to say that in the (roughly) one hundred and fifty thousand Greek and Latin epitaphs known to us, he has collected, arranged, and lucidly commented on everything that might illuminate his topics. There is, in fact, so much that the present reviewer approves of in the book that it will be necessary to mention only a few doubtful points.

Mr. Lattimore always puts himself to the trouble of translating the Greek quoted in his text, but rarely the Latin. This suggests that the reader for whom the work is intended can handle the most obscure and difficult products of the one, while being inadequate for even the simpler examples of the other. This may be so, though it is notorious that hard Latin is more impenetrable than Lycophron. We must, however, be grateful for the many graceful versions the author has given us, while occasionally questioning his interpretation.¹ Minor matters: the Greek historical fragments (e.g., of Castor, p. 38, n. 139) should be cited from Jacoby in preference to Mueller. A good example of literary borrowing in epitaphs (cf. p. 70, n. 368) is the line given on page 155:

¹ E.g., p. 51 (bottom), perhaps, "but it left him dwelling among the immortals, since he shed an immortal and ageless glory on his life."

P. 127 (= JHS, XXXIV, 5) may not *ἡμεῖν* be "for us" and *ἐπιθήλα* be taken by hendiadys, "obviously profitable"?

"et
an a
n. 3
call
the
the
told
an i
by
mo
mig
293
cor
fam
few
I
boo
men
Alt
any
he
wor
dim
jud
tha
vin
nifi
for
We
Cat
con
it w
cal
in
tol
see
mo
and
G
O
Tr
"S

"et quem mi dederat cursum Fortuna peregit," an adaptation of Verg. *Aen.* iv. 653. On p. 72, n. 390, I do not know why the "feeling" is called "Semitic." On the connection between the removal of light and death (p. 161), cf. the amazing passage *Il.* xvii. 645-47. We are told (p. 27) that Aristophanes did not take an idea seriously, but this is later contradicted by implication (p. 45, n. 180). Since pleasant modern parallels are often given, a few more might have been added, such as (p. 130, n. 293) Ronsard's "Afin que vif et mort ton corps ne soit que roses"; or (p. 254, n. 302) the famous passage from Malherbe. There are a few misprints.²

Perhaps the least satisfactory part of the book is the ninth chapter, where pagan elements in Christian epitaphs are considered. Although the author disavows (p. 342, n. 2) any intention of treating symbolism, being, as he says, solely "concerned with the written word," yet he occasionally seems to allow dimly apprehended symbols to confuse his judgment, as when he claims (p. 312, n. 85) that "such expressions as *corporis exula vinculis* . . . are totally unorthodox in significance." Gnostic? But may one not allow for metaphorical expression? Must one not? We are further reminded (p. 313) that "the Catholic Church has not reached any decision concerning the location of Heaven," as though it were the church's business to find geographical expression for the illimitable. And, finally, in the most approved modern manner, we are told (p. 97, n. 73): "Saints are the linear descendants of heroes." I suppose Mr. Lattimore does not mean "lineal"; so we may smile and say with the poet

God's saints are shining lights; who stays

Here long must pass

O'er dark hills, swift streams, and steep ways

As smooth as glass.

W. C. HELMBOLD

Trinity College, Hartford

"Some Aspects of Doric Temple Architecture," by R. D. MARTIENSSSEN; "Space Construction in Greek Architecture," by R. D. MARTIENSSSEN; "Rex Distin Martienssen:

In Memoriam," *South African Architectural Record*, March, 1942, pp. 55-83; May, 1942, pp. 117-53; November, 1942, pp. 302-55.

In the November number of this magazine the work of Dr. Martienssen is surveyed in seven articles written in collaboration by a number of his friends. The titles of these papers indicate the scope of his activity; they are: "The Student and Philosopher of Architecture," "The Architect in Theory and Practice," "The Teacher," "The Researcher in Classical Architecture," "The Art Interpreter and Critic," "The Honorary Editor," "The Professional Man." It is clear that Martienssen was a man of distinguished quality, and his death at the age of thirty-seven is profoundly to be regretted.

The March and May numbers of the *Record*, which is primarily a professional magazine, contain the last two of Martienssen's six papers in the field of classical archeology. It is evident from his own remarks that the libraries available to him were not complete; but he uses recent books of importance, and his information is generally up to date. He does not reach or attempt to reach many novel historical conclusions; but his discussions abound in fresh observation, unusual viewpoints, and sensitive aesthetic interpretation and appraisal. The paper on space construction, which is apparently a condensation of, or excerpt from, the author's thesis for the degree of Doctor of Literature, is particularly notable. Six precincts are considered, largely with regard to the aspects presented to the spectator in his normal progress from point to point; and it is found that the buildings were placed with thoughtful attention to aesthetic considerations of varied and subtle types, though other influences were naturally felt also. "The sanctuary at Sunium represents, perhaps, the highest achievement of the Greek architect in striking a just balance between the attributes of regulated movement in the spectator, and the purity of abstract geometric arrangement." As in other papers by Martienssen, the illustrations include not only standard plans and reconstructions, but both photographs and diagrams by the author.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

² E.g., pp. 27, n. 46; 30, l. 3; 84, n. 468; 142, n. 1; 164, n. 50; 191, n. 148.

BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Books submitted are not returnable.]

- AMYX, D. A. *Corinthian Vases in the Hearst Collection at San Simeon*. ("University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology," Vol. I, No. 9, 207-40, pls. 28-32.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1943. \$0.50.
- BALL, JOHN. *Egypt in the Classical Geographers*. ("Survey of Egypt," published by the Ministry of Finance, Egypt.) Cairo: Government Press, Bulâq, 1942. Pp. vi+203. 750 Mills.
- CARY, EARNEST (trans.). *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. In 7 vols. Vol. IV. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1943. Pp. iv+385. Cloth, \$2.50; leather, \$3.50.
- Classical Studies in Honor of William Abbott Oldfather, Presented by a Committee of His Former Students and Colleagues*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1943. Pp. viii+217. \$4.00.
- DONOHUE, JAMES J. *The Theory of Literary Kinds: Ancient Classifications of Literature*. Dubuque, Iowa: Loras College Press, 1943. Pp. viii+155. \$2.00.
- ERRANTE, GUIDO. *Sulla lirica romanza delle origini*. New York: S. F. Vanni, 1943. Pp. 440.
- LAISTNER, M. L. W. *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts*. With the collaboration of H. H. KING. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1943. Pp. x+168. \$3.00.
- MARCUS, RALPH (trans.). *Josephus*. In 9 vols. Vol. VII: *Jewish Antiquities, Books xii-xiv*. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1943. Pp. viii+788. Cloth, \$2.50; leather, \$3.50.
- MARKMAN, SIDNEY DAVID. *The Horse in Greek Art*. ("Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology," No. 35.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. xviii+211+62 pls. \$5.00.
- MUELLER, SISTER MARY MAGDELEINE. *The Vocabulary of Pope St. Leo the Great*. ("Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," Vol. LXVII.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1943. Pp. xviii+269.
- MYRES, JOHN L. *Mediterranean Culture*. ("Frazer Lecture" [1943].) Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1943. Pp. 51. \$0.75.
- PARSONS, ARTHUR WELLESLEY. *Klepsydra and the Paved Court of the Python*. (Reprinted from *Hesperia*, XII, 191-267.) (Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1942.) Baltimore, 1943.
- ROUSE, W. H. D. (trans.). *Nonnos: Dionysiaca*. With an English translation. Mythological Introduction and notes by H. J. ROSE. Notes on text criticism by L. R. LIND. In 3 vols. Vol. III: *Books xxxvi-xlviii*. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1942. Pp. xii+517. Cloth, \$2.50; leather, \$3.50.
- SEDFIELD, W. J. *Locorum nonnullorum in epistulis M. T. Ciceronis mendose descriptorum emendationes*. Ed. tertia. London, 1943. Pp. 16.
- WEISS, HELENE. *Kausalität und Zufall in der Philosophie des Aristoteles*. Basel: Haus zum Falken, 1942. Pp. 197.

egu-

reek
s in
hns
pls.

The
cho-
es,"
olic
ii+

azer
Uni-
Co.,

and
ated
ion,
ore,

aca.
gical
otes
vols.
sical
sity
td.,
her,

e in
rum
Pp.

der
zum